

1976

Legislative opinions of the members of the Virginia General Assembly toward the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

Marlene Joyce Claya Hager
College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hager, Marlene Joyce Claya, "Legislative opinions of the members of the Virginia General Assembly toward the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia" (1976). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539618616.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-0wj2-5b20>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-19,807

HAGER, Marlene Joyce, 1941-
LEGISLATIVE OPINIONS OF THE MEMBERS
OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TOWARD THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER
EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA.

The College of William and Mary in
Virginia, Ed.D., 1976
Education, higher

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Legislative Opinions of the Members
of the Virginia General Assembly Toward the
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

By

Marlene Joyce Hager

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Education
The College of William and Mary

Williamsburg, Virginia

1976

APPROVAL SHEET

We the undersigned do certify that we have read this dissertation and that in our individual opinions it is acceptable in both scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Accepted April 1976 by:

Daniel R. Gerber
Daniel R. Gerber, Ph.D.

Fred L. Adair
Fred L. Adair, Ph.D.

William F. Losito
William F. Losito, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page	i
Approval Sheet	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	v
Preface	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background.	1
Problem Statement	5
Methodology	16
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH	29
Introduction.	29
Coordinating Agency	29
Legislative Sponsored Research.	37
Legislative Attitudes and Opinion	40
Methodology and the Literature.	47
Conclusions	54
III. AN ANALYSIS OF THE SIX HYPOTHESES AND THE SUPERBOARD CONCEPT	57
Introduction.	57
Population, Procedures, and Response Rate.	57
Hypothesis One: Present Statutory Powers of the State Council.	60
Hypothesis Two: Past Performance of the State Council	64
Hypothesis Three: Strengthening the State Council.	105
Hypothesis Four: Political Affiliation.	134
Hypothesis Five: Geographic Areas of Representation.	152
Hypothesis Six: Leadership Position	173
The Superboard Concept.	177
Summary	189
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	197

Appendices	210
Bibliography	221
Vita	
Abstract	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Legislative Responses on Present Statutory Powers of the State Council	61
2	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Responses by Legislative Leaders to Present Statutory Powers of the State Council.	62
3	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Overall Planning Function	66
4	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Mission Statements.	69
5	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: The Study of Proposed Escalation of Institutions	72
6	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Enrollment Projections.	72
7	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: New Programs.	77
8	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Nonproductive Programs.	81
9	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: New Branches, Schools, and Departments	84
10	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Data Information System	88
11	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Uniform Reporting Standards	89
12	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Space Utilization	92
13	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Budget Recommendations.	94
14	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Continuing Education.	97

15	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Overall Scores for All Respondents on Questions 2 through 13	101
16	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Overall Scores for the Random Sample on Questions 2 through 13	102
17	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Admission Standards	107
18	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Selection of Faculty Members.	108
19	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: New Courses	110
20	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Coordination of Private Colleges.	111
21	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Out-of-State Institutions	113
22	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Single Budget	114
23	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Handling of Budget Monies	116
24	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Private Endowments.	117
25	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Modification of Mission Statements Adopted by the General Assembly	118
26	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Internal Organizational Changes	119
27	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Superboard.	121
28	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Overall Scores for All Respondents on Questions 14 through 24.	123
29	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Overall Scores for the Random Sample on Questions 14 through 24.	124
30	Admissions and Party Affiliation	137

31	Selection of Faculty Members and Party Affiliation	138
32	New Courses and Party Affiliation.	139
33	Private Colleges and Party Affiliation	140
34	Out-of-State Institutions and Party Affiliation	141
35	Single Budget and Party Affiliation.	142
36	Distribution of Budget Funds and Party Affiliation	143
37	Private Endowments and Party Affiliation . .	144
38	Mission Statements and Party Affiliation . .	145
39	Internal Organizational Changes and Party Affiliation	146
40	Overall Scores of the 108 Respondents Cross-tabulated by Party Affiliation. .	147
41	Analysis of Variance: Overall Scores of 30 Legislators and Party Affiliation. .	150
42	Admissions and Geographic Areas of Representation.	155
43	Selection of Faculty and Geographic Areas of Representation	156
44	New Courses and Geographic Areas of Representation.	158
45	Coordination of Private Colleges and Geographic Areas of Representation. . .	159
46	Coordination of Out-of-State Institutions and Geographic Areas of Representa- tion.	160
47	Single Budget and Geographic Areas of Representation.	162
48	Receipt and Distribution of Budget Funds and Geographic Areas of Representa- tion.	164

49	Private Endowments and Geographic Areas of Representation	165
50	Mission Statements and Geographic Areas of Representation	166
51	Internal Organizational Changes and Geographic Areas of Representation. . .	167
52	The Overall Scores of the 108 Respondents Cross-tabulated by Geographic Areas of Representation	168
53	Analysis of Variance: Overall Scores of 30 Legislators and Geographic Areas of Representation	170
54	The Overall Scores of the 30 Legislators in the Random Sample Cross-tabulated by Leadership Position.	174
55	T-Test: Overall Scores of 30 Legislators and Leadership Position	176
56	Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Superboard.	178
57	The Superboard and Party Affiliation	180
58	The Superboard and Geographic Areas of Representation.	181
59	The Superboard and Leadership Position . . .	182

PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to examine the opinions of the members of the 1974-75 General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia toward the State Council of Higher Education. This study was unique in that it was the first research conducted in Virginia to generate data on state legislators' opinions toward the coordinating agency.

The writer wishes to express appreciation for the assistance of her committee members, Dr. Daniel R. Gerber (Chairperson), Dr. William F. Losito, and Dr. Fred L. Adair.

A special thank you is due Mrs. Marcia Gibson and Ann Voloudakis for typing various stages of the dissertation. Mrs. Gibson was responsible for typing very tedious transcripts of the taped interviews of the 30 legislators. Mrs. Voloudakis typed the final copy of the dissertation.

Finally, I am particularly grateful to my husband, David, and my two children, Dave and Michele. They had to endure many personal sacrifices, and participate in many activities without me during my doctoral program. They were extremely patient throughout these three years.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

State control and legislative involvement have been characteristics of public higher education in the United States since its inception. Only the degree of such input has changed over the years. Historically, legislative concern may be traced back three hundred years to the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and the establishment and funding of Harvard College (Moos & Rourke, 1959, p. 258). State control was evident also in the early attempts by legislative bodies to regulate institutional expenditures through their budgetary prerogatives and by attaching riders to appropriation bills (see Moos & Rourke, chap. 2 for complete discussion). In the 19th century, the degree of involvement increased as several state legislatures established statewide governing boards to regulate expenditures, expansion and program duplication in their respective systems of higher education. By 1941, 13 state legislatures had placed the governance of all their public four-year colleges and universities under a single statewide governing board. Twenty-one state governing boards were created by 1972 with the statutory power to apply many new rules, formulas and directions to state institutions (Glenny & Dalglish, 1973, p. 180). The historical record has revealed, then, that a degree of coordination and

control for the state supported institutions has always existed (Dressel & Faricy, 1972, p. 153).

In the last three decades, the trend has been toward the intensification of state control and legislative input. This intensification has taken several forms. First, there has been a move toward a formal, non-voluntary, statewide coordinating board with a legal base of power. Second, the legislatures have tended to increase rather than to decrease the authority of these agencies. And third, the powers of the statewide coordinating bodies have been expanded to include program and budget review, research and planning, formal coordination, and, finally, governance. The reasons for the increasing powers of statewide coordinating councils have been many such as soaring enrollments, limited resources, duplication of academic programs, conflict between institutions, empire building, and the concern for accountability (Berdahl, 1971, p. 252; Dressel & Faricy, p. 1; Moos & Rourke, p. 203).

More specifically, increased state control has been favored because of certain purported benefits. Harris (1974, p. 39) listed eight advantages in his discussion of statewide coordination. They were: (1) the provision of equality of opportunity for all the state's youth; (2) the need for coordinated planning for the state as a whole; (3) the avoidance of duplication of effort and the prevention of wasteful or perhaps destructive competition; (4) the economies of scale derived through the provision of services that could not be

provided as efficiently at each campus; (5) the wiser expenditures of public monies with net savings to the taxpayer; (6) the strengthening of weaker institutions through professional consulting services and purposeful financial allocations; (7) the streamlining of governance by centralizing staff and services; and (8) the elicitation of better public and legislative support by "speaking with one voice" about the needs of higher education. Whether these benefits have actually resulted from state control has yet to be determined by sound empirical evidence. The point is that legislatures and governors have alleged such advantages and have acted to create statutory means for advice, recommendation, and in many instances governance by statewide agencies designed to coordinate and to control higher education. State legislatures have been involved in the active discussion of the problems of higher education, the benefits of coordination, the demands for accountability, and in the final decisions to increase the power and duties of statewide coordinating agencies. They have found support for such legislation and have acted accordingly.

The same demands and the articulation of the problems in higher education have occurred in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Events in the Commonwealth with respect to coordination have been similar to those in other states. In 1956, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia was established and charged with the promotion and development of a "sound,

vigorous, progressive and coordinated" (Code of Virginia, 1974, p. 37) system of higher education. The General Assembly's interest in coordination began with a 1908 recommendation to coordinate financial support for state institutions through a Virginia Education Commission. Other examples of legislative interest in coordination are found in the creation of a Normal Board in 1914 to govern the State's normal schools and in the several study commissions set up by the General Assembly in the 1940's and 1950's to consider proposals for a statewide agency. Out of these legislative reports came the suggestion for a department of higher education, and finally, in 1956 legislation establishing a coordinating body was passed (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, 1974, p. 7).

More importantly, perhaps, the Commonwealth of Virginia has been in the mainstream of the evolutionary process toward increasing the authority and expanding the role of the coordinating body. In 1974, the General Assembly rewrote the provisions for the State Council of Higher Education and gave it a clear mandate to coordinate and not merely to advise the various institutions of higher education. The State Council was empowered with several specific decision making functions such as approving or disapproving mission statements, and approving new academic programs and enrollment projections (Code of Virginia, pp. 38-40). As emphasized in The Virginia Plan, the work of the agency has shifted from the "promotion

and development" of higher education to coordination and planning (State Council of Higher Education in Virginia, pp. 7, 44-46).

Finally, there remain areas of governance in higher education from which the State Council has been specifically exempted. These exemptions have included the selection of faculty, the establishment of admission policies, the determination of tuition and fee charges, and the development of specific courses. Also of significance is the fact that the state institutions have retained their prerogative to present their budgetary and program requirements directly to the Governor and the legislature rather than through the State Council.

Problem Statement

The background material suggested that important issues remain with regard to the legislature and the authority of the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia. Stated in question form, these issues include: (1) To what degree might the General Assembly extend coordination, possibly to include more control over the internal matters related to institutional governance and autonomy? And (2) how much support will the 1974 legislation receive against institutional objections, pressures, and perhaps to new constituent demands made on legislators? Many persons at the institutions have objected to continued encroachments into academic affairs that are

viewed as internal governing prerogatives. They have disliked not having as much input into important decisions affecting long-range planning and the educational needs of their areas. In addition, legislators have begun to respond to political demands made upon them by constituents for new programs and schools nearer large population centers and within proximity to their homes. Goodall (1974, p. 226) suggested that opposition from constituents and their legislators may develop as programs are discontinued or curtailed and/or shifted to colleges near larger urban centers.

A few of these issues have surfaced in Virginia as several institutional representatives and legislators have tested the Council's new powers by taking their cases directly to the legislature. For example, in 1975 George Mason University sought legislative approval for a new law school after the State Council had opposed the establishment of the school, and the University of Virginia asked the legislature to curtail the authority of regional continuing education consortia organized by the State Council. Since then, several Northern legislators have expressed openly their determination to continue their request for the new law school in the General Assembly. As a result, Senator Omer Hirst introduced another bill in the 1976 General Assembly to establish a law school at George Mason University with full knowledge that the bill circumvented the State Council's unfavorable recommendation. Likewise, supporters of Virginia Polytechnic Institute's fight

for a School of Veterinary medicine tried to get a bill introduced in the 1976 General Assembly for the purpose of creating the school. The State Council has not been favorable to the establishment of a new veterinary school in the state. However, it has been in the process of reassessing the need for such a school.

Question two has suggested, then, that in the 1970's as retrenchment takes place in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the statewide coordinating body may be subjected to more legislative scrutiny, circumvention, and direct opposition. Demands and support for coordination may be altered as a result.

Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to investigate the opinions of the members of the 1974-75 General Assembly in the Commonwealth of Virginia toward the statutory authority and the general performance level of the State Council of Higher Education. More specifically, six hypotheses were tested: (1) That legislative opinion will be favorable toward the existing statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education; (2) That the members of the legislature will be satisfied with the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education with respect to its statutory powers; (3) That legislative opinion will be favorable toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education in the future; (4) That there will be no difference in legislative opinion

toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliations; (5) That there will be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' geographic areas of representation; and (6) That there will be no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Definition of Terms

There were several terms employed in this research study that required definition. First, an opinion was defined as a verbal answer to a question about a problematical situation. It has referred to a cognitive response to a stimulus. Opinions are defined often as the access route to attitudes (Lerbinger, 1972, p. 38).

Second, higher education has referred to all public postsecondary educational institutions that have fallen under the coordination powers of the State Council of Higher Education. All public colleges and universities as well as community colleges have been included. Private institutions were not considered to be within the purview of the definition for this study.

Third, leader was defined as a chairman of standing committees of both houses of the Virginia General Assembly and

the eight officers of this body. The classic study of state legislators by Wahlke et al., employed a similar definition of leader. And in his study of Congress, Davidson (1969, p. 192) defined leaders as committee and sub-committee chairmen as well as the officers of the legislative bodies.

Theoretical Context: Autonomy and the Public Interest

Autonomy in higher education has been defined traditionally as the power of a university or college to govern itself with a minimum of outside controls (Berdahl, p. 8; Gould, 1966, p. 5). Wattenbarger (1974, p. 3) defined autonomy as the right of a college to control its own destiny. These definitions have reflected the more traditional view of autonomy as an absolute rather than a relative principle embodying full self-governance and self-determination by institutions of higher education.

It has been customary to speak of full autonomy. However, several scholars such as Wattenbarger have indicated that "the idea of autonomy is an imaginary one" (p. 3) since the power of an institution to fully determine its destiny has probably never really existed. The Carnegie Commission (1973) has reaffirmed the view that autonomy has not prevailed in the "full sense of the word" (p. 17). They stressed that "full autonomy is always limited by the general law and often also by the charter of the institution. Increasingly, it was also limited by state and federal influence and control" (p. 17). The Commission preferred to discuss institutional autonomy in

terms of "institutional independence" (p. 17). Perhaps, the concept of institutional independence may be regarded as synonymous with substantive autonomy, a more common term utilized by Berdahl (pp. 10-12).

More pointedly, autonomy has been defined in both substantive and procedural terms. Substantive autonomy has pertained directly to educational policy and the actual governance responsibilities at the institutional level such as "freedom and flexibility in resource allocation, curriculum planning, faculty and administrative selection and promotion" (Dressel & Faricy, p. 15). Halstead (p. 22) has added to Dressel and Faricy's list most matters regarding student affairs, institutional budget preparation, and campus policing. Halstead stressed that such activities required local study and individual institutional decisions.

The Carnegie Commission's examination of institutional independence has provided a further explanation of substantive autonomy. The Commission argued that institutional independence or substantive autonomy must be preserved in the areas of intellectual conduct, academic affairs, and administrative arrangements. Intellectual conduct was referred to as the protection of academic freedom of expression and the free choice and conduct of research projects by faculty members and students.

The Carnegie Commission (pp. 18-30) proceeded to describe the institution's independence in academic affairs as the

acceptance of decision making by academic authorities in specified academic areas such as the approval of individual courses and course content, the determination of grades, and the awarding of degrees. In the administrative area, the colleges and universities must be allowed substantial leeway in handling financial and personnel matters including the selection and promotion of faculty members, the selection of academic leaders and administrators, and the determination of faculty workloads. In these three areas, the Carnegie Commission affirmed strongly the right of the institution to claim authority and independence without external control, whether it be local, state or federal. Such institutional prerogatives were considered to be essential ingredients in substantive autonomy and in turn important to the significant functioning of the university to transmit culture, to create new knowledge, and to train students for intellectual pursuits.

On the other hand, procedural autonomy has been identified as the non-academic areas of institutional life or those administrative procedures related to carrying on the work of the college or university. Procedural autonomy has been described as "how institutions go about pursuing their goals" (Berdahl, p. 240).

Procedural and substantive autonomy as concepts have been employed by researchers in describing the types and kinds of control placed on public institutions by the state. Historically, there have been many attempts by the state to become

involved in procedural autonomy. For example, states have required line-item budgets, central purchasing, and formulas for space utilization and the acquisition of library books. Recently, the trend has been for the states to move into the substantive areas related directly to policy. This shift has challenged the very nature of institutional autonomy, especially as identified by the Carnegie Commission, Berdahl, Dressel, and Faricy.

Much of the state involvement in procedural and substantive autonomy has been carried on in the name of the public interest and with the understanding that public higher education has a responsibility to serve society. The turning point in the evolution of campus autonomy has been related back to the Second World War when a mass-oriented, public utility concept of higher education began to develop. Increasingly, and problematically for the autonomy of institutions, higher education has taken on a strong public utility outlook. With this outlook has come more regulation and a corresponding loss of institutional authority in the name of public interest. As scholars have suggested, institutional autonomy has been eroded according to what has been considered a necessary control to protect the public interest (Dressel & Faricy, p. 175; Berdahl, p. 270).

Public interest seems never to be defined adequately. Rather it has been described within the broad framework of a state's responsibility to provide for the needs of the people

and to protect its members from the excesses or abuses of public institutions. With respect to higher education, the public has revealed an interest in the rule of law on campus, in useful functions well-performed, in effective use of resources, in responsible self-governance, in political neutrality, in intellectual integrity, and in the provision of adequate information and explanations of all matters of broad public concern (Carnegie Commission of Higher Education, p. 25).

In more concrete terms, the public has demanded through elected legislators: (1) the use of formulas that reflect the quantity and quality of output; (2) effective space management and projection; (3) the designation of a role or function and the facilitation of that role with a minimum of duplication; (4) enrollment projections and a student recruitment program; (5) the development of long-range planning in academic programs and in physical plant operation and construction; (6) effective articulation of transfer student problems between colleges; (7) concerted efforts to meet manpower requirements; and (8) the development of cooperative arrangements in such areas as exchanges of faculty and the sharing of libraries (Halstead, pp. 26-28).

These eight demands have identified some of the many ways in which the state has become involved in the affairs of public institutions of higher education. State involvement has come in the name of the public interest and accountability

for monies directed toward meeting the educational needs and demands of the people. The conclusion must be that as public institutions have chosen to serve society and to provide mass higher education, they have required more financial support, and with the increase in funding has come less autonomy or independence. As the Carnegie Commission stated succinctly, "autonomy is limited ... by the necessary influences and controls that go along with financial support, and by public policy in areas of substantive public concern" (p. 17).

Finally, and perhaps of most importance for this study, legislators have been viewed as one of the principle protectors of the public interest within the political system. It has been their legislation at the state level that has constituted by far "the most significant source of law currently affecting the university" (Glenny & Dalglish, p. 179).

Legislative activity has reflected the changing individual and societal expectations for higher education for the obvious reason that legislators respond to the pressures from their constituencies. In addition, legislators have become much more knowledgeable and sophisticated in analyzing the needs of public institutions. They have added staff to monitor higher education and have had available to them up-to-date statistical data and evidence for making decisions on appropriations and other policy matters. As O'Neil (cited in Glenny & Dalglish, p. 179) noted in a speech given at the Assembly on University Goals and Governance, "The evidence is

mounting that legislators do know just what to do, or at least that they are learning about higher education much faster than the educators are learning about legislation." Therefore, legislators' perceptions have become of vital concern when issues of public interest in higher education arise. The legislators have made decisions based on what they perceive to be the supports and demands for such actions. Based on these supports and demands, they have enacted legislation responsible for establishing the structure and functions of control mechanisms such as statewide coordinating bodies.

The coordinating agency in turn has affected the very nature of institutional autonomy in public higher education. Legislatures have granted these bodies the statutory powers for planning and program and budget formulation that have far reaching consequences for the substantive autonomy of institutions. More significantly, many state legislatures have broadened and strengthened the authority of coordinating bodies in recent years. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, for example, the legislature increased the powers of the State Council of Higher Education in 1974. In so doing, the legislature provided the Council with certain statutory powers that have extended into the substantive realm of the individual institutions' decision making functions.

It has been the aim of this study to investigate the support and direction that Virginia legislators have perceived

to be demanded to protect the public interest in higher education. Particularly, the study has focused on legislators' perceptions of the needs for and strengthening of the statewide coordinating body. One of the results of this examination has been to provide a better understanding of institutional autonomy as it has been restricted by a coordinating agency.

Methodology

Population

The population of the study consisted of the 140 members of the House of Delegates and the Senate of the Virginia General Assembly during 1974-75. The 140 members of the General Assembly were stratified into two groups; the one group included the 107 rank and file members of the House and Senate and the other consisted of the 33 leaders of these two legislative bodies. For purposes of stratification, the leaders were defined as the chairmen of standing committees of both houses and the eight officers of the General Assembly. A similar definition of leader was used in one of the more significant studies of legislative opinions (Davidson, p. 192).

From each of the stratified groups, a random sample of 15 members was drawn. Each of the 30 members drawn in the sampling procedure was interviewed in a structured setting with a questionnaire serving as the basic interview schedule. An identical questionnaire was mailed to the remaining 110 members

of the General Assembly for their respective responses.

The rationale for using the stratification procedures was to include more of the leaders of the General Assembly in the interview sample. The defined leaders of legislative bodies have been found usually to be the most knowledgeable on higher education in past interview research. The rank and file members have been shown to have a minimum of information on higher education policy and so the interview has not always been fruitful with them (Eulau & Quinley, 1970, pp. 41-42).

In previous studies, researchers have reported also that state legislators made good subjects for investigation. They have found legislators to be cooperative, accessible, and responsive to interview techniques and capable of completing a questionnaire. In addition, legislators usually provide a high rate of return with the mailed questionnaire (Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan, Ferguson, 1962; Ruby, 1973; Nowlan, 1973; Davidson, 1969). Wahlke et al., in particular, concluded that a specialized population like American state legislators will provide reliable data when directly and intensively interviewed.

Instrument and Procedures

The mailed questionnaire and the structured personal interview were the methods used to collect data for this study of legislative opinions toward the statewide coordinating agency. A certain amount of experience has been accumulated

through previous research in the use of structured interviews and questionnaires with politicians, especially legislators. In fact, in one research study, it was asserted that "significant political information could be obtained only from politicians themselves or from their close associates" (Heard, 1950, p. 886).

There have been several major studies of legislators in which researchers have employed the mailed questionnaire, the structured interview or both of these instruments (Eulau & Quinley, 1970; Wahlke et al., 1962; Davidson, 1969; Epstein, 1958; Moos & Rourke, 1959). These investigators have reported that these survey instruments have provided "reliable" and "fruitful" results.

Further, researchers have found the interview very useful as an instrument for obtaining in-depth information from legislators. These scholars utilized the interview to probe into the context and reasons for answers to questions. They stressed that the interview allowed them to be flexible and adaptable to a particular respondent's situation and background (Eulau & Quinley, p. x; Moos & Rourke, p. 375). In one study, investigators felt that an ancillary advantage of the interview was that in questioning the interviewee in his natural habitat, they gained insight into the institution and environment in which the legislators worked as well as into his attitudes and perceptions (Wahlke et al., pp. 451-452).

Questionnaire. The first data collection method developed

for the study of legislative opinions toward the State Council of Higher Education was the questionnaire. Included in the schedule were twenty-six questions, twenty-four of which were designed to elicit Likert-type scaled responses of agreement and disagreement. The final two questions in the survey were developed to obtain demographic information about the legislator's political affiliation and geographic area of representation. These twenty-six questions provided the empirical data for testing the six hypotheses of the study.

More specifically, question one of the instrument was designed to measure hypothesis one by eliciting legislative opinions toward the existing statutory powers of the State Council of Higher Education. Questions two through thirteen were developed to test hypothesis two by asking for legislative opinions about the past performance of the Council. The Council's past performance was evaluated in twelve areas specified in the Virginia statutes. For example, these included the making of budget recommendations, the approval or disapproval of new degree programs, the development of a data information system and the coordination of continuing education offerings.

Questions fourteen through twenty-three were designed to measure hypothesis three by eliciting legislative opinions toward the strengthening of the powers of the State Council in the future. These questions proposed extending the powers

of the State Council to matters involving admission standards, the coordination of private institutions, the selection of faculty members, and the certification of all new courses for the state system.

Question twenty-four inquired as to whether legislators would abolish the State Council of Higher Education and all institutional governing bodies in favor of a superboard structure.

Questions twenty-five, twenty-six and fourteen through twenty-four provided the legislative responses to test hypotheses four and five. Hypotheses four and five were that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward strengthening the powers of the State Council when controlling for members' political affiliation and geographic area of representation.

Questions fourteen through twenty-four were developed also to test hypothesis six by examining whether there were differences between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council.

The questionnaire was administered to the 110 members of the General Assembly in the following manner. Three mail contacts were planned and executed for the purpose of obtaining a satisfactory percentage of completed questionnaires. The initial packet contained a cover letter, questionnaire, and stamped self-addressed reply envelope. Three weeks later, a

second contact was made with a letter to remind legislators of the study. Included with the second letter was another questionnaire and stamped self-addressed reply envelope. The final contact was made by postcard and it suggested the importance of the study and the need for legislators to respond. The postcard indicated also that a third questionnaire could be mailed. In two instances, legislators asked for a third questionnaire.

Interview. The interview schedule included the same questions contained in the mailed questionnaire, but with provisions for more open-ended answers. The personal interview provided the opportunity for the legislator to express any detailed explanations, justifications, and qualifications of answers that he desired. In most cases, it was conducted in the familiar surroundings of the legislator such as in his office or in small meeting rooms at the State Capitol. The entire interview usually lasted about forty minutes and was tape recorded for accuracy and efficiency. There were social amenities exchanged before the start of the interview and an effort was made to relax the legislator. The confidentiality of the responses was stressed by the interviewer, and in only one case was there any serious concern expressed over the use of tapes. When the legislator was told that each tape was numbered and not named and that the tapes could be returned to him, he felt satisfied.

Most of the legislators seemed uninhibited and free with

both time and answers. They were frank in their replies and seemed to be reliable respondents trying to do their best in answering the questions. As Wahlke et al., (p. 445) suggested, this study seemed to reaffirm that legislators were cooperative subjects during an interview.

In addition, and of some importance, the Virginia legislators were accessible. For example, they were most helpful in trying to arrange appointments for the interviews. They tried to find a time for an interview when in Richmond on legislative business. In this way, they made themselves more accessible to the interviewer. In addition, there were several occasions in which legislators left committee meetings at the Capitol or interrupted campaigning activities at home for the interview. In other words, the 30 legislators who were interviewed were accessible, cooperative, and supportive toward the study.

The questionnaire and interview schedules are shown as Appendixes A and B.

Analysis of Data

The six hypotheses were tested by examining the empirical and normative data generated from the responses to the questionnaires and the interviews. The empirical data was analyzed in the following manner. First, frequency and percentage distributions were developed from the Likert-type scaled items in the questionnaire. These scaled responses were assigned numerical values from 1 to 5 with strong

disagreement ascribed the low value of 1 and high agreement assigned number 5. In this way, each legislator received a score from 1 to 5 on each of the 24 individual questions. These scores were coded for the computer and became the bases for the frequency and percentage distributions.

These distributions were utilized in several ways. The responses to each of the 24 questions were broken down into a frequency and percentage distribution table, using the five categories of scaled responses. Then, the frequencies and percentages generated by legislative responses in questions 14 through 24 were cross-tabulated with each legislator's political affiliation, geographic area of representation and leadership position.

Second, each legislator was given an overall score on two different sets of questions. The first set included questions 2 through 13 and was designed to measure a legislator's satisfaction with the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education. The second set involved questions 14 through 24 and it reflected a legislator's agreement or disagreement with strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

The overall scores for the sets of questions were developed by a different numerical system than the frequencies. Each legislator was given an overall score based on the following computational method that reflected direction of the opinion as being either negative, positive or neutral. Each

response of strongly disagree was computed as a minus one (-1), and a minus five tenths or (-.50) was ascribed to disagreement. Neutral opinions were given a zero (0), while strong agreement was assigned a plus one (+1) and a plus five tenths (+.50) was computed for agreement. From these totals, legislators were categorized as either strongly in disagreement with -6.5 to -12, in disagreement with -.50 to -6, neutral with 0 points. A legislator in strong agreement had a +6.5 to +12 and one in agreement accumulated a +.50 to +6.

Overall scores were designed to be used for several purposes. One, they were computed into frequency and percentage distributions for all respondents. Two, they were utilized in the analysis of variance and t test applied to the random sample of 30 interviewed legislators.

The normative data was compiled from the structured interviews of a random sample of 30 legislators, 15 leaders and 15 rank and file members of the General Assembly. These legislators were asked to provide explanations or reasons for their answers to each of the 24 questions in the study. This normative information was employed in a manner similar to the Eulau and Quinley (1970) study as narrative information in the body of the study. Such narrative information suggested why the particular legislator felt as he did. It offered some practical, theoretical, and philosophical bases for the legislative opinions vis-a-vis the particular items in the

questionnaire. They added depth to the study by providing explanations for answers to scaled questions in the schedule.

With such empirical and normative information, it was possible to test each of the six hypotheses including the concept of a superboard. Hypothesis number one, or the measure of legislative satisfaction with the statutory powers of the State Council, was tested by legislative responses made to question number one of the survey. These answers were analyzed in two frequency and percentage distributions. The one presented data on all 108 respondents in the sample and the other examined the opinions of the 15 defined leaders. In this way, legislative satisfaction with the present statutory powers of the Council was evaluated.

Hypothesis number two was tested in questions two through thirteen of the questionnaire. Responses to these twelve questions were investigated in three ways. One, frequency and percentage distributions were developed for each of the twelve individual questions. Two, these twelve questions and their legislative responses were explained further with interview materials from the 30 legislators in the random sample. Three, two frequency and percentage distributions of overall scores were assessed. The one included all 108 respondents and the other, the 30 members of the random sample of leaders and rank and file.

Hypothesis number three dealt with the strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. It was

measured in questions 14 through 24 of the questionnaire. Responses to these eleven questions were examined in three ways. One, frequency and percentage distributions were created for each of the eleven individual questions. Two, frequency and percentage distributions of overall scores were evaluated for all respondents and for the 30 interviewees in the random sample. Three, the normative information gathered in the interviews was broken down into the most commonly given explanations for legislative positions on the extension of Council responsibilities.

The fourth hypothesis was that there would be no differences in legislative opinion toward the strengthening of the statutory authority of the Council when controlling for political affiliation. It was tested in the responses to questions 14 through 24. Answers to these eleven questions were analyzed in three ways: (1) for each individual question, cross-tabulations were developed to compare legislative response with political affiliation; (2) legislators' overall scores were cross-tabulated with political party; and (3) the analysis of variance technique was applied to the overall scores of legislators in the random sample to see if they varied with the independent variable of party affiliation.

The fifth hypothesis was concerned with whether there were differences in legislative opinion toward an extension of the State Council's authority when controlling for the members' geographic areas of representation. The legislative

opinions expressed in questions 14 through 24 were compared with a legislator's geographic region. Cross-tabulations were created to report the frequencies and percentages of the comparisons. Legislators' overall scores derived from the random sample were cross-tabulated with the designations of geographic representation and analyzed by the use of the analysis of variance. The independent variable was geographic area of representation.

The sixth hypothesis dealt with whether there were legislative differences in opinion toward the strengthening of the powers of the State Council between the defined leaders and the rank and file. It was tested in response to questions 14 through 24. The random sample of 30 legislators only was used. Their answers to the eleven questions were evaluated in two ways. One, their overall scores were cross-tabulated with leadership position. Two, the t test was applied to the overall scores to see if they varied with the independent variable -- leadership position.

Finally, the question pertaining to the creation of a superboard for the state of Virginia was examined by utilizing (1) a frequency and percentage distribution of legislative opinions on question 24; (2) a cross-tabulation of legislative responses controlling for political affiliation, geographic area of representation and leadership position; and (3) the normative information collected in the interviews.

Three additional chapters follow the present one. In

Chapter Two, the normative and empirical literature dealing with statewide coordinating bodies, the role of state legislatures in higher education, their opinions and attitudes toward involvement in the affairs of colleges and universities and the research related to the methodology employed in this study were reviewed.

In Chapter Three, the six hypotheses of the study and the concept of a superboard for the governance of higher education in the Commonwealth were analyzed. Empirical data derived from the scaled items in the questionnaire and normative information from interviews with 30 legislators were investigated in determining the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses.

A summary and the conclusions of the study are contained in Chapter Four. Each of the hypotheses, along with the concept of a single governing board, was reviewed and the conclusions were presented as suggested in the analyses of the empirical and normative data.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH

Introduction

The review of the literature pertaining to this study may be categorized as: (1) normative and empirical examinations that have defined the structures and functions of coordinating agencies for higher education; (2) legislative research of a normative nature aimed at the solutions to the problems of higher education; (3) empirical research focused on state legislators' attitudes and opinions toward higher education and the coordinating agency; and (4) research related to the methodology used in this study.

Coordinating Agency

Berdahl (1971), Halstead (1974) and Chambers (1961) have contributed to an understanding of the structures and functions of the various types of coordinating bodies of public higher education. They have presented an evolutionary picture of the changes in these agencies' responsibilities and powers. Their research, as well as that of other scholars, has revealed the criticisms made of the statewide coordinating boards.

According to Halstead (p. 7), the various types of state agencies can be distinguished by the composition of their membership and the degree of centralized authority granted by

the State over public institutions.

First, Berdahl (p. 22) has classified agency membership into four observable types: those with all institutional representatives, those with institutional representatives in the majority, those with public representatives in the majority, and those with all public representatives.

The institutional representatives have received membership on boards usually by virtue of their positions as presidents or trustees of their institutions. Currently, there are only three states that are classified as having either all institutional or a majority of institutional representatives on their boards (Halstead, pp. 7-9). The remainder of the statewide bodies have a public membership.

The public members of statewide coordinating agencies have most often been appointed by the governor, with the consent of the state senate (Berdahl, p. 53). The public membership has reflected the American tradition that lay trustees govern institutions of higher education. According to Berdahl, this tradition has accounted for the reasons why so many states have either all or a majority of public representatives on their statewide coordinating board.

Public membership has raised the question of the lay member's educational expertise. It has been answered by the fact that most agencies have professional staffs to provide the public boards with information and recommendations. Berdahl has reported that lay members rely heavily on such

assistance, and in turn, they must be careful to select and hire a professionally competent staff.

Second, Berdahl has distinguished four categories of state agencies on the basis of the degree of centralized coordinating authority exercised over all senior public institutions within the state. The four divisions made were: no state coordinating agency, the voluntary statewide coordinating association, the statewide coordinating board and the consolidated governing board. These four types of agencies have represented a continuum from little state involvement to significant involvement in substantive decision making as held by the consolidated governing bodies. Berdahl (p. 41) pointed out, however, that the classification of no state agency does not necessarily mean that the legislature or governor does not exercise control through their budgetary prerogatives.

Berdahl and Halstead have described in more detail the characteristics of these state agencies. Halstead (pp. 9-10) has identified a voluntary coordinating association as one composed of institutional officers whose chief interests encompass budget preparation and allocation of legislative appropriations. He has stressed that they have not been very effective coordinating bodies because of their inability to secure voluntary cooperation from competing institutional members.

Statewide coordinating boards have been created by

statute. They do not supersede institutional governing boards. There are three types of statewide coordinating bodies and Berdahl has identified them in the following manner:

1. A board composed in the majority of institutional representatives and having essentially advisory powers.

2. A board composed entirely or in the majority of public membership and having essentially advisory powers.

3. A board composed entirely or in the majority of public members and having regulatory powers in certain areas without, however, having governing responsibility for the institutions under its jurisdiction.

(p. 19)

These coordinating bodies have been granted functions that extend over a wide range of possible activities. Some of their responsibilities have included planning, budget review, program approval, capital outlay review, and administration of Federal programs.

Consolidated governing boards have been created by state statutes. These statutes have provided boards with the authority to govern all institutions under their jurisdiction. In addition, they have given the single governing body comprehensive functions and the necessary administrative powers for discharging their responsibilities. Powers of the consolidated governing boards have included the development of a

consolidated budget for the system, reallocation and elimination of existing programs, approval of all new courses and new programs, and strong internal administrative authority.

Third, an evolutionary view of state coordinating agencies has emerged from the review of the literature. The literature has revealed that single statewide governing boards were created in the late 19th century and reached a peak in the first two decades of this century. They have undergone a slight revival in recent years. Voluntary arrangements for coordination were established in the 1940's and 1950's, but have been replaced in most states with compulsory coordinating bodies. In the 1950's, the statewide coordinating boards gained impetus and they have continued to develop and increase in power (see Berdahl, chap. 2, for a complete discussion).

There were additional observations made in the literature concerning the development of coordinating agencies in the last three decades. These included the following: (1) practically all states now have some type of formal coordination; (2) the trend is toward more regulatory powers for these agencies; and (3) on the whole, these supervising bodies are involved actively in a wide range of activities including those of a procedural and substantive nature (Berdahl, pp. 246-248; Dressel and Faricy, pp. 153-163; Glenny, 1959, p. 325).

Halstead (p. 8) has added perhaps yet a fourth point. He has found that the preferred agency to coordinate higher education since the Second World War has been the statewide

coordinating board. He indicated several reasons for this choice. The agency has been easily established by statute. It has been more readily accepted by institutions reluctant to give up initiative and autonomy to a governing board. It has provided for a professional staff to conduct continuous planning and advisory services. It has tried to be a "neutral agency" objectively serving both the interests of the State and those of the educational community.

Finally, the research has not only described the evolutionary moves toward more state control, but it has indicated the criticisms directed at these state bodies in carrying out their particular functions. Chambers has been one of the most persistent critics of compulsory coordination opting instead for voluntary associations. As far back as 1961, he evaluated the coordinating boards by saying: "That any of these schemes is of itself a guarantee of better public support, better efficiency and economy, better service to the people of the state ... is definitely not demonstrable from the available evidence" (Chambers, 1961, p. 7). More specifically, Chambers (pp. 65-67) criticized the boards for the development of a coercive bureaucratic machinery that produced mediocrity in higher education. Higher education, as Chambers views it, must accomplish its missions by being allowed flexibility, individuality, and a reasonable sphere of freedom and control of its own planning.

Harris has refined the criticisms of statewide influence

and control into seven indictments. They are presented in their entirety as follows:

1. Equality among the state's colleges tends to result in equal mediocrity not in equal excellence. Rather than encouraging the unique and the excellent, state controls encourage their demise.

2. The claims made for saving the taxpayer's money never materialize. In fact, the opposite seems to be true -- total costs usually go up when state boards take over.

3. Diversity in higher education is good and should be increased rather than stifled. Competition is not necessarily bad nor is all duplication necessarily wasteful.

4. The services provided by central staff to help local colleges are usually more than offset by continual demands made by the central staff for reports, data, information and research.

5. In striving to be even-handed, state boards often make bad educational decisions. Attempts at strengthening weak institutions all too often seem to involve weakening strong institutions.

6. The bureaucracy grows like a weed in a spring garden. And, the critics point out, since bureaucracies work this way, desk sergeants at Central Staff are soon controlling "colonels" and "generals" in the field.

7. A state governing board and its central staff offer a single, visible, easy-to-hit target for pressure groups of citizens, faculty or students, who are determined to reshape higher education for their own ends. (pp. 39-40)

Despite these seven concerns, more state control has evolved and the criticisms of Chambers, Harris and others have seemed to fall on deaf ears (see also Corson, 1974, pp. 19-26).

Coordination in Virginia

In Virginia, a statewide coordinating body was created by statute in 1956. Its membership, development, and evolutionary process has followed that of many other such bodies. The board has an all public membership, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the General Assembly. Its evolutionary process has been marked by an increase in regulatory powers. For example, the 1974 revisions of state statutes provided the State Council of Higher Education with more influence and control over the state's colleges and universities. The Council was prescribed the duties of approving or disapproving all new academic programs including undergraduate and graduate ones; approving or disapproving the creation and establishment of any new departments, schools, colleges, branches, divisions or extensions; approving or disapproving enrollment projections and new or revised mission statements. They were given the powers to discontinue

non-productive academic programs, develop a uniform comprehensive data information system, establish uniform standards and systems of accounting, recordkeeping and statistical reporting, and approve or disapprove changes in space utilization (Code of Virginia, pp. 38-40).

Legislative Sponsored Research

State legislatures have sponsored various types of research in search of solutions to the problems of higher education. Of special interest, they have initiated studies on coordination of state institutions of higher education. Historically, these studies materialized in three forms: the state survey, the master plan and research directed toward the development of a coordinating body. It was often the case that the studies of coordination grew out of or were a part of the state survey or master plan.

Halstead and Glenny have differentiated the survey and master plan, principally in terms of their scope and emphasis. Halstead (p. 11) has stressed that a survey focuses primarily on inspection and fact gathering, while a master plan incorporates recommendations and a blueprint for action. The survey has been descriptive and limited; the master plan has been more comprehensive and action oriented. Glenny (1967) distinguished the characteristics of a master plan from a survey as "the volume of data collected; the depth of analysis; the integration of programs, budgets, and building priorities

to provide unity of purpose; the full inclusion of the non-public institutions; and the means for step-by-step implementation of the plan with simultaneous review and revision leading to fulfillment of major goals."

In an evolutionary sense, the state survey was the precursor of the modern state master plan. The state survey extended over five decades from around 1912 to the early 1950's. The earliest surveys were conducted in 1912 by North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. By 1936, 51 state surveys had been reported (Eells, 1937). In other words, states have been involved for many years in describing their systems and identifying their problems along with possible solutions. It might be stressed that the Virginia General Assembly sponsored several other studies in addition to the 1912 state survey. One of the more important surveys was done in 1947 and it proposed a department of higher education, the forerunner of the statewide coordinating body (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, p. 7).

Halstead reported that the transition from state survey to master plans was gradual, but by 1948 the Strayer Report could probably be classified as a master plan. The Strayer Report of the California system of higher education was comprehensive. It evaluated current and future needs of post-secondary education, analyzed area facilities and needs, and considered recommendations for varying types of publicly supported higher education. During the 1950's and 1960's

23 states had completed master plans; 8 others were in the process of completing them and 7 more expected to develop such plans (Abrahams, 1969, p. 8).

Virginia developed its first master plan in 1967 as mandated by the legislature. It was intended as a ten-year guide for the future development of the State's higher education community. The plan included general directions and recommendations for implementing state goals. A second master plan was presented in 1974 due to the vast changes that took place in higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia since the 1967 document. The 1974 master plan included 14 immediate higher education goals, suggested over 40 recommendations for actions and set the direction and future emphasis for each public institution in the state. Among the goals indicated in the plan were accessibility, diversity, quality programs, cooperation between all elements of the system, and accountability for maximum utilization of state human and physical resources (State Council of Higher Education in Virginia, pp. 13-41).

In the 1950's numerous legislative commissions and investigations were carried on to identify, describe and evaluate solutions to problems of higher education. Of importance, the most often suggested solution rendered in these legislative studies was some type of centralized control for public institutions of the state (Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education, 1958, pp. 7-8; South Carolina

Fiscal Survey Commission, 1956, pp. 18-23; Massachusetts Special Commission on Audit of State Needs, 1958, pp. 31-33; North Carolina Commission on Higher Education, 1955, pp. 18-97). In some cases, a master plan was linked to and a part of the suggestions and responsibilities for a coordinating body (Halstead, p. 10).

These legislative studies of the 1950's have pointed to an active awareness and participation on the part of legislatures in the general area of higher education and in the specific ones of coordination and centralization. The most important result of these investigations was the enactment of legislation that established statewide boards for higher education. These studies led to a statewide coordination in West Virginia, Wisconsin, and North Carolina. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, a comprehensive legislative study in 1950 served as the basis for the legislation and eventual creation in 1956 of a statewide coordinating body (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, p. 7).

Legislative Attitudes and Opinion

Empirical research focused either entirely or partially on legislative attitudes and opinions toward higher education and coordinating agencies has the most direct relevance for this study. Not only do these studies have importance in terms of substance, but also as they have contributed to an understanding of their interview and questionnaire

methodologies.

One of the most comprehensive studies on state governmental relationships with higher education was the Moos and Rourke research financed by the Ford Foundation. It included over 400 interviews and questionnaires administered to government officials in 30 states. Among the respondents, many were legislators.

In the main, the legislative responses seemed to be general reflections on higher education, but a number of findings revealed opinions toward statewide control: (1) legislators indicated there was increased pressure for a coordinated statewide approach; (2) they were unsure of the means by which the goal of coordination was to be achieved; (3) they were aware of the problems and demands of higher education that might be resolved through coordination such as the competition between schools, and ineffective use of resources; (4) they felt more open communications were needed in legislative-campus relations and that the lack of honest and full information prompted legislators toward more state control; and (5) legislators felt that some type of coordination might result in more businesslike conduct in the affairs of state institutions (Moos & Rourke, pp. 258-287). The large number of states included in the sample suggested that a nationwide concern was being voiced by legislators toward some means of solving the problems of their state system of higher education.

Ten years later, another study by Heinz Eulau and Harold Quinley (1970) was conducted and it included a sample of 86 legislators from nine states, and employed interviews as an instrument of its methodology. The Eulau and Quinley research, like the Moos and Rourke work, can be compared to this study. It has the additional advantages over the Moos and Rourke research of being more up to date and focusing primarily on the legislative decision maker. Further, Eulau and Quinley have provided an important rationale for studying legislators and their opinions of higher education.

For example, these two researchers have suggested in their introduction to the report, "American state legislators are strategic decision makers in policies affecting higher education. The resources mobilized for colleges and universities, the goals to which such resources are allocated, and how they are distributed depend to a great extent on the views and decisions of the nation's legislative bodies. Legislators intervene in higher education ... through conscious planning" (p. vii).

Eulau and Quinley went on to indicate that they believed the surveys would highlight "at least some of the problems that beset the political process, and especially the legislative process, and which in turn create problems for higher education" (p. vii). The authors have provided a strong recommendation for focusing research on state legislators because they are important decision makers for higher educa-

tion in the political process.

The Eulau and Quinley study employed the open-ended interview schedule in order to discover the legislators' assumptions, perceptions, attitudes, and expectations about higher education. They were interested in obtaining in-depth answers and taped the interviews to ensure accuracy of such lengthy responses. The investigators chose respondents intimately connected with legislation or appropriations for higher education such as chairmen of education and finance committees and floor leaders. They felt these legislators would be especially informed and interested in higher education. Much of this same methodology and procedure was utilized in this study.

One of the principal findings of the Eulau and Quinley research was somewhat different from the earlier study by Moos and Rourke. It revealed that legislators had gained more of a working knowledge and understanding of coordination. Specifically, legislators were not only positive toward coordination, but they were capable of indicating reasons for and the problems associated with coordination in higher education. Of most concern to this study, the Eulau and Quinley research reported: (1) better coordination of requests from state supported institutions was viewed by legislators as assisting their decisions; (2) coordination was considered by legislators to be some kind of prelegislative screening and distilling of information; and (3) legislators felt that there

was a need for more and better coordination of all segments of higher education including the private colleges and universities. On occasion, there were negative responses to strong coordination with the legislators complaining that they had lost part of their prerogative to make decisions to the supervising council in their states. The Eulau and Quinley study revealed the demand and support for coordination among legislators. And it stressed that legislators felt a personal need for these agencies to assist them in their decision making responsibilities. The Eulau and Quinley research provided the most relevant comparison to the findings in this study of legislative opinions on statewide coordination in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Finally, two recent doctoral dissertations have analyzed legislative opinions in a single state as this study has done. But Ruby (1973) and Nowlan's (1973) empirical research focused on opinions toward higher education in general rather than on a particular coordinating agency. Ruby's study of Mississippi legislators was much too general to be of any comparative value, except perhaps in the area of methodology. Ruby employed the dual instruments of a questionnaire, and interview.

On the other hand, Nowlan's study has revealed some findings on lawmakers opinions toward state control of public higher education. He found that control of the purse strings was perceived by the lawmakers as the most effective and

appropriate way for the legislature to impose its values upon the higher education community. Other than budgetary considerations, the legislators felt their role in policy-making for higher education was limited to the broadest policy guidelines. However, the legislators indicated two exceptions. They were willing to act as mediators and decision makers when the Governor and the Board of Higher Education reached a deadlock on important issues, and when public pressure dictated certain actions as during the period of campus unrest in the 1960's.

Also of importance, Nowlan's 1973 doctoral dissertation substantiated the complaint by legislators, as voiced in the Eulau and Quinley report, that they were losing input into the budgetary process of higher education. Nowlan found that two thirds of the Illinois legislators felt that "too little control" was exercised by them in the financial affairs of the state system of higher education. They indicated a sense of loss of legislative responsibility (Nowlan, pp. 196-200). Nowlan pointed out that Illinois has a statewide coordinating body that plays a very active role in the budgetary process as mandated by the legislature when created in 1961. In fact, in its first few years of operation, "the Board's budgetary recommendations seemed to have been enacted with little if any change" (p. 144). Nowlan made it clear that the legislative complaints may indeed have merit since the Board and the Governor seem to have the real power in making policy for the

colleges and universities.

Nowlan's research highlighted another common complaint from state legislators. They felt that they received inadequate information on which they might assess the needs and problems of higher education. They desired more personal contacts with the Board of Higher Education and representatives of the various institutions. One legislator felt the informational gap was serious enough to call for the creation of a Legislature Liaison Commission on Higher Education to develop expanded exchange of materials with the Board of Higher Education. He was unsuccessful as the Governor vetoed the bill at the request of the executive director of the Board.

Nowlan's study provided, then, some overall insights into the roles felt and played by state legislators in matters of higher education. On the whole, legislators sensed the need for limited involvement in the affairs of colleges and universities, yet desired better information upon which to make more effective decisions especially in budgetary matters.

Nowlan used the questionnaire in his survey of the 120 lawmakers in Illinois. The questionnaire consisted mainly of forced choice items asking for judgements on higher education in poor, good, and excellent categories. Nowlan's utilization of the questionnaire has lent some credibility to the instrument employed in this study to ascertain legislative opinions toward a coordinating agency of higher education.

Methodology and the Literature

The review of the literature related to the methodology applied in this study was focused on the following concerns: (1) the use of questionnaire and interview instruments; (2) the legislative population and sample, and (3) statistical techniques for analyzing the data in legislative opinion research. Some of the literature in these three categories was presented earlier in Chapter One of this study, and it will be reintroduced for summary and continuity purposes.

First, the questionnaire and interview appear to be the most reliable and frequently used instruments for eliciting legislative opinions. The Nowlan, Ruby, Moos and Rourke, Wahlke et al. and Davidson research in legislative opinion employed either one or both of these methods. Moos and Rourke, Davidson, and Ruby utilized the two methods and in the process presented an important rationale for the dual instruments. For example, Moos and Rourke indicated that the questionnaires uncovered the more subtle aspects of the relationships between the state and higher education, and the interviews offered a more intimate and complete picture of the same. In the interviews, respondents were seemingly willing to "tell all" (Moos & Rourke, pp. 371-373) about campus-state relations.

Ruby reported about the same reasons for using both approaches including the assertion that interviews substantiated the results of the questionnaires and obtained more

in-depth opinions from legislators.

In the classic study by Wahlke et al. of legislative attitudes and opinions, a high level of success with the interview technique was reported. They reviewed numerous other studies of state and national legislators that had employed the interview instrument. But it was probably their monumental work that lent credibility to approaching a specialized population like American state legislators through the use of direct and intensive interviews. They were able to offer the evidence that legislators were accessible, reliable, and willing to give of their time and know-how for the interviews (Wahlke et al., pp. 441-452). In fact, their evidence was convincing enough to make their study the basis for all future legislative behavior research (see support for their work in Davidson, p. 191).

Davidson's comprehensive research on The Role of the Congressman confirmed the Wahlke experience with interviews as he arranged, conducted, and analyzed 118 interviews of his own with Congressmen. Davidson admitted his indebtedness to the Wahlke group for their methodological insights on handling legislative behavior in the political process.

In addition, Kerlinger's more general behavioral research text has provided information in the use of the questionnaire and interview instruments in factual, opinion, and attitude research. Kerlinger discussed how and when to use the two techniques as well as the advantages that they possess. He

reported that the personal interview and questionnaire are direct means of data collection resulting in the advantage of a great deal of information on and about the respondent. He has found also that they are flexible and adaptable to many contexts and varying kinds of samples.

Kerlinger called the personal interview the "most powerful and useful tool of social scientific survey research" (p. 412). He went on to say that the interview permits the advantage of probing into the situation and the reasons for answers to questions. Information on what people think and do, their opinions and attitudes can be derived from interviews. Of significance to this study, Kerlinger stated that "the personal interview can be very helpful in learning a respondent's own estimate of his reasons for doing or believing something" (p. 413). In many cases, the respondent's actions will be determined by his perceptions or reasons why he should be drawn to such activities. The interview and the questionnaire can be important tools for obtaining direct information about how a respondent feels, his opinions and reasons for action -- or some of the very important elements to be learned in this study of Virginia Legislators by these two survey instruments.

Of further significance to this study, most of the interview and questionnaire schedules in the research under review contained some "scaled" questions. Most of the scholars turned to the scale to measure the intensity of the

legislative opinion and attitude. For example, the Nowlan, Davidson, and the Wahlke et al, studies used questions with Likert-type scaled responses comparable to the schedule in this study of Virginia lawmakers. Specifically, Davidson (pp. 197-200) and Wahlke et al. (pp. 197-200) utilized levels of agreement and disagreement in developing some of their questions for interview schedules.

Second, a review of the literature suggested that either the method of using the finite population of all legislators in a state body or a random sample of the group was a defensible research approach. Both methods provided reliable results.

Wahlke et al. (p. 456) reported that when an entire population of a state legislature was used it avoided the familiar sampling worries of a survey. As the Wahlke group pointed out in their section on statistical problems, the question of making statistical inferences from a sample to a population does not arise when using the population. Of importance, the Wahlke et al., Ruby, and Nowlan research utilized the population of all legislators in a specific state assembly. A similar population was employed for the purposes of this study.

Wahlke's group stressed that when an entire, but particular legislature is employed in empirical research, it may represent a sampling of a universe of legislators past and present. They went on to say, "the concept of such a

'hypothetical universe' makes explicit a point often overlooked. Any ... comparative study is in a sense a sample ($N=1$) of a universe of political phenomena. The precise limits of this universe are not well-defined, but there is a consensus on their location in rough terms" (Wahlke et al., p. 457). They have made the point that the activities and opinions of one legislature may be indicative of some generalities to be drawn of others.

On the other hand, the random sample of legislators has importance for significance testing, precisely because not all factors of possible relevance in an analysis are controlled. Randomization has provided for valid statistical inference. Through random sample, uncontrollable but constant factors, have been so distributed that they have an equal chance to influence results. The random sample has been used in many studies in order to have a representative and unbiased sample of the population (Kerlinger, pp. 118-120).

Kerlinger explained that there are several kinds of random samples other than the simplest form. He noted that the stratified sample is a common form of random or probability sampling. Random sampling is employed in one or more of the stages in developing a stratified sample. Specifically, the stratified sample is derived by dividing a population into strata such as men and women, leader and non-leader. Then a random sample is drawn from each group.

Davidson used the stratified sample in his study of

Congressmen. He divided Congressmen according to party identification and leadership position. Part of the rationale for distinguishing such a stratum as leadership position has been in the quality and quantity of information derived from the particular respondents in each stratified group. Davidson (pp. 77, 109) felt the leader and non-leader classification provided for some valuable comparisons of differences between groups in terms of their functions and opinions. In this study, a stratified sample was developed based on leadership position as suggested by Davidson.

Third, the statistical and analytical tools examined in this review of the literature were the analysis of variance and t test techniques or those utilized in the analysis of data in this study. A general definition and explanation of these two methods may be found in Kerlinger's book, Foundations of Behavioral Research and Galfo and Miller's Interpretating Educational Research. Kerlinger pointed out that these two techniques identify, break down, and test for statistical significance variances that come from different sources of variation. Galfo and Miller (1970) have added that these tests were "derived from mathematical consideration of the distributions that result from measurements of traits in representative (random) samples of large populations" (p. 160). As a result, the random sample has been one of the basic assumptions underlying both statistical tools.

Kerlinger explained further that the t and F tests

reveal to the investigator whether "a relation exists" (p. 227). "The relational fact is inferred from the significant differences between two, three or more means" (p. 227). Statistical tests like t and F have provided an indirect way of saying that there is or is not a relation between the independent variable or variables, and the dependent variable. If the independent variable has had an effect on the dependent variable, then the "equality" of the means of the experimental or non-experimental groups that would be expected if the numbers being analyzed were simply random numbers, would be upset. The effect of a really influential independent variable should be to make means unequal. Kerlinger said, "the more unequal the means, the wider apart they are, the higher the relation, other things equal" (p. 228).

When relationships do not exist between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the result is similar to sets of random numbers, and consequently random means. The differences between the means would only be chance fluctuations. The t or F test would not show them to be significantly different (Kerlinger, p. 228).

The null hypothesis is expressed in the use of the t and F tests. It is hypothesized that the groups or samples to be tested for mean differences are indeed nothing more than one or more of the many pairs of representative samples from the same population. Since the distribution of mean differences in such a case has a mean of null, the hypothesis is expressed

as an assertion that the pair or groups of samples are representative of such a distribution, i.e., that the sample pair or groups are probably one or more of the many whose mean of the distribution of differences is null. If a test of the hypothesis is applied and the mean difference proves quite large, the null hypothesis can be rejected at an appropriate level of confidence (Galfo & Miller, pp. 153-154).

Finally, t and F tests can and have been used in non-experimental studies such as the present one on legislative opinions. Kerlinger (p. 147) said that strictly speaking they are more appropriate to experimental data, but he admitted that even the inventor of the analysis of variance, Fisher, used the technique for non-experimental data. In addition, Kerlinger has related in his book studies in education, psychology and other social sciences that have applied analysis of variance approaches to non-experimental data.

Conclusions

The review of the literature has identified the importance of the statewide coordinating body in terms of its responsibilities, influence, and control of public higher education. In particular, it was suggested in the literature that statewide coordinating agencies have followed an evolutionary progression toward more involvement in the procedural and substantive affairs of colleges and universities. These agencies have developed state master plans, reviewed programs

and budgets, made enrollment projections, and eliminated duplicative programs. State coordination of postsecondary institutions has been both criticized and praised. It has been praised for attempting to create more efficiency and cooperation, and criticized for encouraging mediocrity and a larger bureaucracy within state government.

The review of the literature stressed that legislators have had an active interest in the affairs of higher education. They have played an important role in the creation of coordinating bodies and in the determination of what will satisfy the public interest in return for financial support from the state. Legislators have been responsible for initiating legislation, generating studies and master plans for higher education while maintaining a continuous activity in the budgetary matters affecting state institutions.

The review of the literature that has focused on legislative opinions toward coordination of higher education has suggested that legislators are positive toward such coordination. In addition, the legislators are found to be aware of the practical and theoretical reasons for and the problems associated with coordinating bodies. They have expressed the desirability of more and better coordination for all segments of higher education. On a personal level, legislators have felt that coordination should act as some kind of prelegislative screening and distilling of information for them.

Finally, the review of the literature provided an

understanding of the various methodologies used in legislative opinion research. The data collection methods found reliable were the interview and questionnaire. The statistical techniques discussed as applicable to non-experimental data were the analysis of variance and t tests based on a random sample of a population.

CHAPTER THREE
AN ANALYSIS OF THE SIX HYPOTHESES
AND THE SUPERBOARD CONCEPT

Introduction

In this chapter, the six hypotheses of the study and the concept of a superboard for the governance of all higher education in the Commonwealth were analyzed. The data obtained from the study were presented and analyzed as follows: first, information on the population, the procedures utilized in the study, and the response rate of those who returned the questionnaires were described; second, each of the six hypotheses were tested by analyzing the data gathered in the questionnaires and structured interviews; and third, data on the concept of the superboard was presented. Finally, a summary of the chapter was given following the presentation and analysis of the data.

Population, Procedures and Response Rate

The population of the study consisted of the 140 members of the House and Senate of the Virginia General Assembly during 1974-75.

The 140 members of the General Assembly were stratified into two groups; the one group consisted of the 33 leaders as defined previously, and the other group contained the 107 remaining rank and file members of the two legislative bodies.

From each of the two groups, a random sample of 15 members was drawn. Each of the 30 members drawn in the sampling procedure was interviewed in a structured setting with a questionnaire serving as the basic interview schedule. An identical questionnaire was mailed to the remaining 110 members of the General Assembly for their respective responses. A copy of the questionnaire utilized in the study is shown in Appendix A.

The schedule included twenty-six questions, twenty-four of which were designed to elicit responses on legislative satisfaction with present statutory powers, the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education, and the agreement or disagreement with strengthening the powers of the state agency. The final two questions obtained the demographic data of the respondents' area of geographic representation and political affiliation.

As indicated, the questionnaire was mailed to 110 members of the General Assembly and followed up by a letter and postcard in order to encourage the legislators to return the instruments.

The structured interviews were conducted in the familiar surroundings of the legislators' business offices or at the State Capitol. The respondent was given the opportunity to contribute any detailed explanation, justification or qualification of his answers. No time limits for the interview were imposed. The interviews averaged about 40 minutes,

and were taped. On the whole the legislators seemed open, cooperative, and frank in their answers and unrestrained by the taping process. They seemed to be reliable respondents who tried their best to answer the questions.

In addition, the legislators were accessible and cooperative. For example, they scheduled interviews when on business at the State Capitol. They were concerned about making it simpler for the interviewer to collect the data without having to travel to every part of the state. On several occasions, the legislators interrupted committee meetings at the Capitol or campaigning activities at home to be interviewed. All of the selected leaders and rank and file members of the General Assembly were interviewed. The results substantiated Wahlke (1962) and Davidson's (1969) contention on the approachability and cooperation of state legislators.

The overall response rate to the questionnaire by the 1974-75 Virginia General Assembly was 77.1%. One hundred and eight of the 140 legislators in the original sample responded. The high rate of response was especially notable considering that the questionnaire reached many legislators during a campaign period. Several legislators expressed their inability to complete the questionnaire because of excessive campaign activities. The rate of response was approximately 10% higher than that obtained in similar doctoral dissertations. For example, Ruby's dissertation involving Mississippi state

legislators and higher education policy was returned by 67% of House and Senate members (Ruby, p. 20).

The response rate was significant compared to the common rate of return for mailed survey research which Kerlinger (p. 414) indicated was 40% or 50% with 60% being considered a good response.

Hypothesis One:

Present Statutory Powers of the State Council

The first hypothesis under study was that legislative opinions would be favorable toward the present statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education. Question number one of the questionnaire and interview was constructed to provide data to support or deny the hypothesis. The legislative responses to question one were analyzed in several ways: First, these answers were analyzed in two frequency and percentage distributions. The first presented data on all 108 respondents in the sample and the other examined the opinions of the 15 defined leaders. Second, the legislative responses to question one were explained further with interview materials from the 30 legislators in the random sample.

All 108 respondents answered the first question. From this total, 74 legislators, or 68.5%, indicated satisfaction with the present statutory powers of the State Council by either agreeing or strongly agreeing with statement one. In

Table 1, a frequency distribution table of scaled responses of the 108 legislators is presented.

Table 1
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Legislative
Responses On Present Statutory Powers
of the State Council

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	0	0
Disagree	14	13
Neutral	20	18.5
Agree	66	61.1
Strongly Agree	8	7.4

Note. N = 108

More than three fifths of the respondents were satisfied with the powers provided the State Council in 1974.

The defined leadership of the House and Senate seemed also to be favorable toward the responsibilities granted the Council. In Table 2, a breakdown of how the fifteen defined leaders in the random sample felt about Council's authority is provided.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Responses
by Legislative Leaders to the Present Statutory
Powers of the State Council

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	0	0
Disagree	2	13.3
Neutral	2	13.3
Agree	10	66.7
Strongly Agree	1	6.7

Note. N = 15

As suggested in the Table, the leadership group had about the same percentage of dissatisfied members (13.3%) as the overall sample of respondents. Fewer chose to be neutral (13.3%) and instead identified themselves as either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statutory powers of the Council. Eleven of the 15 leaders, or 73.4%, were satisfied with the present powers.

From the data, it appeared that the General Assembly was satisfied with the statutory powers of the State Council, and hypothesis number one was accepted.

Several explanations for the legislative satisfaction were cited in the interviews. First, legislators felt that the 1974 statutory powers were needed by the State Council if it was to

have adequate power and authority to accomplish the tasks of advising the legislature and the Governor on higher education, and effectively coordinating the state's colleges and universities. For example, a typical response of those interviewed was that the Council required "the authority to coordinate" and "settle quicker and with more effectiveness the rivalries and disputes between the existing institutions."

One Assembly leader indicated that "prior to this enabling legislation, they (State Council) had little or no authority" to deal with such problems as nonproductive programs or coordination of new programs for the Commonwealth's colleges and universities. On the whole, legislators seemed genuinely concerned that there be an effective system of coordination for the state's system of public higher education. In fact, even those legislators interviewed who disagreed with the first question did so because they wanted a "much stronger" State Council with the "statutory strength" to solve "growing pain problems," "avoid duplications," and "remedy disparities."

Next, several legislators appeared willing to wait and see how the State Council of Higher Education carried out its responsibilities as provided in the 1974 legislative mandate before contemplating any other options. Some legislators observed that the Council should be given the "time to prove itself."

The majority of the legislators then; indicated their

satisfaction with the present statutory powers of the State Council. They believed that statewide coordination of higher education was of benefit to the Commonwealth of Virginia since it provided for less duplication, decreased institutional rivalry, and established more equity in the system.

Hypothesis Two:

Past Performance of the State Council

The second hypothesis investigated was that the members of the legislature would be satisfied with the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education with respect to its statutory powers. Questions two through thirteen in the schedule were developed to measure legislative satisfaction of the Council's performance in twelve areas of statutory responsibilities including their overall planning function and their role in coordinating a system of continuing education programs for the state. The data collected from these twelve questions were analyzed in the following: (1) the frequency and percentage distributions generated from responses to each of the questions; (2) interview materials gathered to clarify and explain legislative opinions; (3) overall satisfaction scores for

the 108 respondents; and (4) overall satisfaction scores for the 30 legislators in the random sample.

Frequency and Percentage Distribution:

Questions Two through Thirteen

First, frequency and percentage distributions of legislative responses of agreement or disagreement were developed for each of the questions that described areas of Council authority. The discussion follows the same sequence that was used in the questionnaire.

Question two. In question two, legislators were asked whether the past performance of the State Council in carrying out its overall planning functions for the state system has been satisfactory. Members of the General Assembly gave the Council's past performance in overall planning its second highest percentage of satisfaction with 56.6%. Only the Council's coordination of continuing education received a higher percentage of positive responses. Of the 108 respondents, 61 indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed with the Council's planning activities. The particular frequency and percentage distribution of legislative responses to question two is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Overall Planning Function

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	0.9
Disagree	21	19.5
Neutral	23	21.3
Agree	55	50.9
Strongly Agree	6	5.6
No Response	2	1.9

Note. N = 108

More than half of the legislators felt that the State Council's past performance of its overall planning functions had been carried out satisfactorily. The interviews highlighted some of the reasons for the satisfaction as well as the reasons why approximately one fifth of the Assembly members were either neutral or dissatisfied.

Satisfied legislators explained their positive responses by stressing vast improvements in overall planning "in the last four or five years." One legislator indicated, "I think that their record has been better in recent years." Another said they had been making a "genuine effort" in the last few years. The legislators presented as evidence of the Council's effective performance the development of "more definite plans,"

more direction in creating "new degree programs," the limitations on the number of new programs, and the adoption of a long-range plan for the state system.

These same legislators viewed the planning activity as the Council's "major job." For example, a member of the Senate felt they were doing a good job and that "the fundamental principle behind the Council of Higher Education is orderly, proper, and reasonable planning." Of note, the neutral and dissatisfied groups indicated also the primacy of the planning function. No disagreement was evident on that point among the legislators.

On the other hand, the dissatisfied legislators cited two major reasons for their negative positions. They believed that the State Council had the necessary planning powers, but what planning had been accomplished was unsatisfactory. In their view, the Council had "not performed well." Justifications for this position were that the Council was "disregarding existing realities" in various parts of the state, and placing more emphasis on quantity to the point that "quality has been sacrificed." Cost overruns, overbuilding, duplication of programs were specified also as examples of the unsatisfactory performance of the Council in planning.

A second reason offered by dissatisfied legislators was that the Council had not done enough planning and should exercise its authority to promote "more orderly planned growth." A member of the House of Delegates indicated that such planning

meant providing more cooperative endeavors between institutions in the state, and more sharing of facilities and faculty.

Legislators who gave the neutral response seemed to share one explanation for their posture on the Council's performance. They were not willing to judge what they did prior to 1974 because the Council lacked the power to accomplish much. These same legislators felt that the agency has had insufficient time since 1974 to prove itself. For example, one Senator said, "I think it has been too soon to judge what they have done under the stronger power."

It appeared from the interview material that the legislators felt strongly about the primary importance of the overall planning function. Approximately 20% of the respondents would have liked to have seen more and better planning. However, the majority of the legislators appeared to have been satisfied with the past activities of the Council, especially those related to the development of a long-range plan and the direction and limitations placed on new degree programs.

Question three. Question three elicited legislative opinions on the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving the mission statements of the Commonwealth's colleges and universities. The Council's past performance in the area of mission statements ranked seventh in legislative satisfaction out of the

twelve statutory responsibilities under investigation. There were 42.6% of the respondents who indicated satisfaction with past efforts of the agency. The frequency and percentage distribution for responses given on mission statements is presented in the following Table.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Mission Statements

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	19	17.6
Neutral	41	38.0
Agree	39	36.1
Strongly Agree	7	6.5
No Response	2	1.9

Note. N = 108

Less than one half of the legislators, or 46 of 108, were satisfied with the past performance of the State Council in this area of mission statements. Slightly more than 17% registered dissatisfaction. Neutral responses on this question and a few others in the survey equaled approximately one third of the sample. It was apparent from the structured interviews that as the questions became more specific and the

issues unfamiliar, there was an increase in the number of legislators who sought the comfort of the neutral category. For example, four of six legislators who selected the neutral response to the question in the interview described themselves as "unfamiliar with the progress of the Council" with respect to mission statements. One member of the Senate simply stated, "I have no way to judge it." Another reported he did not have information on "goals of each institution and the related progress."

On the positive side, a closer look at the frequency distribution table revealed that 6.5% of the sample "strongly agreed" with the past performance of the Council in sanctioning mission statements. These legislators expressed the opinion in the interviews that the Council had improved in the last couple of years, and were doing a good job in certifying the purposes of the state's colleges and universities. One of the House leaders stressed that the agency had not only worked well in this area of responsibility but had been "uniform in their application of this policy." Another member of the House said that he was satisfied with Council's performance and thought it "good" even though he had some strong personal disagreements with the agency on the mission of a particular college within his district.

Taken together, the data did not reveal a high level of legislative satisfaction with State Council activity related to mission statements. A qualification, however, was that a

substantial number of legislators appeared unfamiliar with and therefore unable to judge this Council activity.

Questions four and five. In the structured interviews, many legislators seemed to relate question four with question five and so it would be helpful to analyze them together. In question four, legislators were asked whether the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in studying the proposed escalation of various institutions in the state system had been satisfactory. Question five was more specific. Legislative responses were sought about the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education related to its approval or disapproval of enrollment projections.

The members of the General Assembly ranked the more general question of escalation fifth in satisfaction as compared to the eighth position assigned to the enrollment projection function. As shown in Table 5, nearly one-half, or 48.1%, were pleased with the Council's efforts in studying the proposed escalation of various institutions. The responses shown in Table 6 revealed 39.8% approved of enrollment projections. A complete description of the data collected in responses to questions four and five is provided in the following tables.

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
The Study of Proposed Escalation of Institutions

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	0.9
Disagree	24	22.2
Neutral	29	26.9
Agree	47	43.5
Strongly Agree	5	4.6
No Response	2	1.9

Note. N = 108

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Enrollment Projections

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	0.9
Disagree	32	29.6
Neutral	28	25.9
Agree	40	37.0
Strongly Agree	3	2.8
No Response	4	3.7

Note. N = 108

The pattern of legislators' responses contained in the two tables indicated that questions four and five may have been related in interview answers, but they were differentiated enough for the escalation function to receive about 10% higher positive responses. There were also more legislators who were dissatisfied with the Council's actions on enrollment projections with about one third of their responses falling into the disagreed or strongly disagreed categories. The reasons for these differences were revealed in the interview explanations.

The legislators believed very strongly that studying the escalation of institutions and certifying enrollment projections should be among the prerogatives of the State Council. There was no question about where these responsibilities should be exercised. As a Senator member stressed, "let it on an individual school basis and you're letting the alumni associations and everybody get carried away." He went on to say that "the best approach" was for the Council to handle these responsibilities. He felt the Council had made "great improvement" in these areas.

Legislative differences of opinion occurred when it came down to looking at escalation of institutions, enlargement, and enrollment projections as actual numbers being suggested for the various colleges and universities. There seemed to be little agreement on the specific number limitations that should be placed say on the University of Virginia or George

Mason University. Part of the controversy concerning size limitations arose due to the fact that these figures were readily available, debated, and publicized so that legislative opinions have been rendered. One member of the Assembly pointed out that an "awful lot has been said on the subject."

The interviews suggested explanations for why legislators do not like the limitations on numbers. These reasons included political, and economic ones as well as concerns for educational quality and flexibility.

Legislators tended to disagree with limitations set on enrollment for political reasons, especially when these limitations did not appear to be in line with what a particular section of the Commonwealth envisioned for its colleges. For example, Northern Virginia legislators wanted George Mason University to be allowed to grow larger and more rapidly.

Some Republican members of the Assembly were worried about the economics of escalation and enrollment projections. They applauded limitations set by the Council and were concerned that the "projected drop in enrollment be carefully accounted for in upcoming fiscal building programs." They did not want to see money spent unnecessarily. Some legislators felt the Council was doing this; others were critical.

Educational concerns were voiced by legislators in

terms of quality versus quantity. One education committee member said that "what we should concentrate on is the quality. I think the money that has previously been spent on large structures should be put into faculty salaries and into improving the quality of education." Another member of the Senate was concerned for quality of life on the campus and for less of a computerized attitude toward students. He said that the Commonwealth should not be geared to "the big state U program," and he didn't want universities with "35 and 40 thousand students." He felt enrollment policy for universities should not exceed 20 thousand students. He didn't want a "computerized, social security number" system of education.

Several legislators thought flexibility should be the watchword. One Senator voiced the concern that he "hated to see limitations set on the growth of any institution." A House member gave the following reason for flexibility. "I think your program has got to be planned around offering the services to that particular area that the population is going to demand." He believed that some sections of the state have experienced a population explosion and others were anticipating one.

In summary, the legislators wanted the State Council of Higher Education to study escalation and approve enrollment projections; but then they felt it their role to debate the findings. In many cases, they were dissatisfied with the Council's work when it came down to actual numbers. Enrollment projections were desirable but accompanying suggestions for specific limitations received legislative disagreement, mostly due to political considerations.

Question six. Legislative opinion was sought on the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving requests for new programs. The State Council's performance in certifying new programs was ranked fourth in legislative satisfaction among the twelve statutory activities. About 48% of the respondents appeared content with the work of the Council on new programs for the Commonwealth's colleges and universities. The frequency and percentage distribution of the data generated by question six is presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
New Programs

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	3.7
Disagree	29	26.9
Neutral	20	18.5
Agree	45	41.7
Strongly Agree	7	6.5
No Response	3	2.8

Note. N = 108

While nearly half of the legislators were in agreement with the work of the Council on new programs, there were also more than one third of the Assembly members who were dissatisfied. More legislators registered dissatisfaction on question six than on any other of the twelve statutory functions. There seemed to be controversy over the development of new programs in the Commonwealth. The interviews suggested why there was a difference of opinion over what new programs were to be developed by the various colleges and

universities in the state.

The diversity of opinion seemed to result from how legislators perceived their role or input in new program policymaking for higher education. It was obvious from the interviews that some members of the General Assembly believed that they should play an active role. One stated that he did "represent the interests of constituents" and he was more aware of their needs than was the Council. These same legislators exhibited a strong political interest versus broader educational perspective on statewide coordination of new programs. They looked at the short-term political gains to be achieved by new programs and not long-range planning or needs of the state. One Senator criticized his colleagues for not taking a "broader, informed rather than a provincial position on new programs."

The political dimension of new program approval was obvious from the interviews. Dissatisfied legislators complained about a shortsighted Council which withheld approval of one of their local projects such as a new criminal justice program, a new graduate degree, or law, optometry, and veterinary schools. They indicated that they would continue to fight for these programs on behalf of strongly articulated con-

stituent interests.

On the other hand, satisfied legislators saw little if any role for themselves in the area of new programs, except as they became an item of budgetary consideration. A House member stated rather strongly, "the legislature should stay out of it." A colleague reiterated, "I don't believe the legislature can get in the field of legislating curriculum, otherwise there is no way to control it." These legislators generally felt as one Assembly member remarked, the State Council has the "knowledge, know-how, the planning, the resources to make those decisions." He realized how difficult it was for the State Council to make such decisions and believed that the legislature "ought to back them up."

Satisfied legislators were very complimentary about the State Council's improvement in handling new programs. One senior House member stressed that there was "tremendous improvement over the past." Others registered similar accolades as "improved considerably," "moved in the right direction," "improved a lot," and that the Council tended to see the "larger picture including relationships with other states."

There were diverse opinions among legislators in the area of the Council's work in sanctioning new programs. The political dimension was obvious from the interviews as some legislators expressed their intent of pursuing the best interests of their constituents even if these interests sometimes circumvented Council recommendations.

Other legislators felt the Council should be the final authority in approving or disapproving new programs. These legislators appeared satisfied with the Council's discharge of its responsibilities in the area and believed the legislature should defer to its judgements.

Question seven. In question seven, legislators were asked whether the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in discontinuing non-productive programs in the state system had been satisfactory. The Council's past performance in this area was ranked sixth in legislative satisfaction out of the twelve statutory powers. The legislators' responses to question seven are presented in the following table.

Table 8
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Nonproductive Programs

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	2.8
Disagree	28	25.9
Neutral	27	25.0
Agree	39	36.1
Strongly Agree	8	7.4
No Response	3	2.8

Note. N = 108

As indicated in Table 8, less than half, or 43.5%, of the members of the House and Senate seemed to be satisfied with the State Council's elimination of nonproductive programs. Over 50% of the legislators chose either the neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree responses in relation to the Council's actions that led to the termination of nonproductive programs.

Even though there appeared to be some significant differences of opinion in this area, the interviews suggested that there was little real controversy

surrounding this activity of the Council, especially when compared to some of the strong statements made about new programs. Several reasons were offered that explained the non-controversy. First, the Council's real power in this area materialized only recently with 1974 statute. As one member of the Senate indicated, "they've just gotten the authority to do that and they are doing a fine job." Next, the programs discontinued thus far have generally been rather innocuous and deemed to be of little real value to the schools or the political constituencies represented by the legislators. Finally, many legislators stressed that they "just didn't know enough" about this activity to have formed a real opinion. Several responded that it was "too specific" a question about the Council's work. Specificity again seemed to be met by the legislators with a relatively safe neutral response.

Even those legislators who disagreed did not express very strong sentiments about nonproductive programs. They thought the Council might be "a little more aggressive," or that it was "too conservative" about eliminating the programs and that it had tended to be somewhat slow in operationalizing

the process. These comments, however, were relatively mild in comparison to the opinions voiced concerning new programs.

The satisfied legislators were also content with brief remarks about the "good job" the Council was doing. They mentioned the "50 programs" discontinued by the Council. And they wanted to see the Council move forward to eliminate others that demonstrated little value. These legislators felt such efforts represented an important new activity of the Council, especially helpful "in times of inflation and tight money."

Generally, legislators were reticent in their comments about Council's work in eliminating non-productive programs. The reticence was probably due to their lack of information and the minor nature of Council's actions in this area.

Question eight. Question eight elicited the General Assembly members' responses on the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving the establishment of new branches, schools, or departments. They assigned the State Council their third highest satisfaction ranking for the exercise of this statutory power. As shown in Table 9, 52.8% of the

legislators agreed that the Council's past performance had been satisfactory in this area.

Table 9
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
New Branches, Schools, and Departments

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9
Disagree	15	13.9
Neutral	30	27.8
Agree	50	46.3
Strongly Agree	7	6.5
No Response	4	3.7

Note. N = 108

Table 9 has also shown that the Council's responsibility for establishing new schools, branches received the lowest dissatisfaction rating among all twelve functions under examination. Only 15.8%, or 17 legislators disagreed with Council's work in the area.

The structured interviews revealed that there was a relationship between legislative thinking on new schools and new programs. Some legislators did not separate the issues into two discrete areas. Strong

remarks carried over from the Council's activity in new programs to the issue of new schools. To many of them, the proposed law, veterinary and optometry schools were enmeshed in both statutory powers. Several legislators repeated the same criticisms that they had made of the State Council's sanctioning of new programs. For example, one House member said that the Council was "too conservative" in the entire new program and school area. Another reiterated his opposition by saying, "I think that the shift in population concentration has not been accommodated in the planning of the State Council as adequately as they should have." He felt that certain sections of the Commonwealth had been treated unfairly by the Council with respect to the establishment of new schools and programs.

On the other hand, there were also many legislators that seemed to recognize the difference between decisions rendered on new programs and those made concerning new schools. The frequency distribution and the interviews confirmed this view. The statistical information revealed some shift since a smaller percentage of members of the House and Senate disagreed with the Council's policymaking for new schools as compared to new programs. Nearly twice as many legislators disagreed with new program decisions than they did with new schools. For example, among the 30 interviewees, 4 of the 8 legislators

who were dissatisfied with new programs shifted to a positive position on the Council's recommendations on the establishment of new schools. The interview data pointed out why some legislators felt differently about creating new schools.

Mainly, legislators believed that new schools, or branches must receive very thoughtful consideration and study. Recommendations from Council should be weighed carefully against any relevant political considerations. These legislators believed the State Council had the knowledge to investigate such matters and that the Council should be supported unless there were "facts and figures to justify otherwise." A House member said, "the legislature doesn't have the expertise" to evaluate new schools. A colleague from the Senate felt that he would "probably limit the legislature's direct involvement in the creation of a new school or institution." He went on to say that "the State Council should address the question."

Satisfied legislators contended that rigorous consideration of new schools was dictated by the poor economic situation, projected enrollment declines, overproduction of graduates in many degree areas, and the tremendous budgetary constraints. They indicated that these factors were weighed when evaluating reports from the Council on new schools. In so doing, they found recent Council studies with their recommendations to be "very persuasive." Many

members of the General Assembly shared the sentiments of one House member who concluded that there must be an agency to "put a brake on unlimited expansion" and that "empire building" by college presidents must be halted.

There appeared to be more legislative concern about whether the Commonwealth really needed or could pay for a new school than there was for purely local political considerations. One legislator confided that even though he was compelled to vote for a new veterinary school, he hoped it was defeated because the Council's recommendation against the proposal was essentially correct. He felt other states could provide the necessary space for Virginia students. State Council decisions in the area of new schools seemed to have received more thoughtful attention from legislators. They took a substantially broader perspective on the establishment of new schools than they did on new programs.

Questions nine and ten. Questions nine and ten received similar responses from legislators. Therefore, they were analyzed together. In question nine, legislators were given the opportunity to decide whether the State Council of Higher Education's development of a data information system had been satisfactory. In question ten, they commented on the State Council's past performance in developing uniform standards for reporting, accounting and recordkeeping. Respondents saw these two questions involving issues of a highly technical and specific nature. As expected from the

analysis of previous questions, many of them responded by choosing to remain neutral or by not answering at all. Aside from question three, questions nine and ten had the largest number of neutral and no responses. The more specific the question or information required to answer it, the more a legislator tended to take a neutral posture. The specific-neutral response pattern is shown clearly in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Data Information System

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9
Disagree	19	17.6
Neutral	40	37.0
Agree	31	28.7
Strongly Agree	5	4.6
No Response	11	10.2

Note. N = 108

Table 11
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Uniform Reporting Standards

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	3.7
Disagree	17	15.7
Neutral	40	37.0
Agree	38	35.2
Strongly Agree	2	1.9
No Response	7	6.5

Note: N = 108

Thirty-seven percent of the legislators opted for the neutral responses to both questions. Slightly less than 20% of the Assembly members disagreed with the Council's past performance in these two areas, while slightly more than one-third were satisfied. The two questions also received similar responses in the interviews where legislators related them in terms of their technical and specific character. For example, neutral legislators reported that it was "hard" for them to answer the questions because they were "unfamiliar" with these specific areas of Council responsibility.

Satisfied legislators pointed out that the Council

had made great improvements toward establishing a data information system and developing uniform reporting standards. They seemed to believe that the uniform reporting standards helped to create a good base of information for the data information system. In addition, these legislators felt that uniform reporting standards provided a foundation upon which to make "comparisons" between institutions in the state. In turn, such comparisons would be available for legislative or executive use in decision making. Legislators reported that the Council was already disseminating such information to them, and they found it useful. A House member observed that the Council supplied "information about enrollments and costs and that sort of thing," and "generally speaking they've done a good job in that area." Thus, the Council was praised for creating a data information system and uniform reporting standards, and for employing them to fill the information needs of legislators.

Dissatisfied legislators reported that the Council's data information system needed improvement. One member of the Assembly offered that he knew "a little bit about this problem with data processing" and "the education end of it has been especially poor." Another legislator reported that what was required was "fast

and quicker results" in getting desired information. He complained, "it takes months in order to gather information that we ought to be able to get in just a few hours." This was where uniform standards for reporting and a rapid system of data retrieval and analysis would be of maximum assistance.

The difference in opinions between the satisfied and dissatisfied seemed to be primarily in terms of the breadth and sophistication of the data information system and the reporting, recordkeeping procedures. However, it was apparent from the interviews that even the dissatisfied legislators perceived evidence of improvement in these technical areas of the Council's functions.

Question eleven. Legislators' responses were elicited on whether the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving space utilization changes has been satisfactory. The response pattern was similar to that of questions two, nine and ten since there was a considerable number of legislators who chose to remain neutral. It was a question that required some facts and figures upon which to form a judgement. Many members of the General Assembly reported that they did not have such information. More than one third

of the legislators chose to remain neutral. As indicated in Table 12, only 37% indicated satisfaction.

Table 12
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Space Utilization

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	3.7
Disagree	25	23.1
Neutral	33	30.6
Agree	36	33.3
Strongly Agree	4	3.7
No Response	6	5.6

Note. N = 108

The legislators' responses shown in Table 12 suggested that there were real differences of opinion concerning Council's efforts in the area of space utilization. While 37% of the legislators responded in agreement, 26.8% disagreed and 30.6% gave neutral responses. In these percentages, there was little evidence of any consensus of opinion on the performance of the State Council in the area of space utilization.

The neutral opinions of legislators were not difficult to explain. They offered the same explanations

for their position as they did on other questions related to specific technical functions. They were unfamiliar with the Council's activity or unaware of what progress had been made in space utilization. One Senator stated that he "knew that they've had some problems," but he didn't know "whether they had improved on them or not."

On the whole, dissatisfied legislators differed from the others on whether the Council had progressed far enough in insuring adequate space utilization. The satisfied members of the Assembly believed that the Council had "exposed wasted space" and the institutions were trying to correct problems. But dissatisfied legislators indicated the State Council had not been aggressive enough. For example, one Delegate argued, "I don't think that the State Council has directed its attention to this problem on an adequate basis. They have not focused on it ... in some institutions there is a very satisfactory utilization and in others there is not." These legislators wanted the Council to get tougher and render more effective space utilization at all institutions. The satisfied Assembly members felt the state agency was "scoring pretty high" in affecting necessary changes.

Question twelve. The Commonwealth's legislators

were asked their opinions concerning the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in making budget recommendations. They responded by registering the second lowest percentage of support for the Council's budget recommendation function. The only lower percentage of positive responses came from the question on the Council's work in developing a data information system. The total distribution of legislative responses to question 12 is shown in Table 13.

Table 13
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Budget Recommendations

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	7	6.5
Disagree	24	22.2
Neutral	36	33.3
Agree	34	31.5
Strongly Agree	2	1.9
No Response	5	4.6

Note. N = 108

A lack of consenses in the responses to the question is suggested by the data reported in Table 13. Almost equal numbers of the legislators chose to agree,

disagree, or remain neutral. The information in the interviews provided some explanations for these differences of opinion.

First, most legislators were unsure of how to answer this question. Several found it difficult to determine the role of the Council in the budgetary process. They were aware that the Council had an advisory function and also that many of its recommendations were "attacked," or had "little attention" paid them. Some faulted the Council for not being more aggressive in the budgetary process. Others felt it had little statutory muscle to make recommendations stick.

Second, satisfied legislators thought the Council was doing the best job possible given the circumstances. They were pleased with the development of the "peer group formula" and thought the Council was trying to remedy disparities between institutions. They believed that their colleagues should support the Council's recommendations rather than be guided by political considerations.

Third, dissatisfied legislators felt the Council had little real power in budgetmaking. Despite its existence and statutory power, the same competition that existed between schools in the past was still evident. From their perspective, these legislators felt

it was still a case of the school that had the "most effective lobbyist down here" usually gained the most. Practically speaking, it meant that the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute received the largest portion of the budget.

In addition, the dissatisfied legislators wanted a sophisticated, "performance type of a budget program where they could relate the dollars to definite programs." Budgeting by objectives, they believed, would provide them with an empirical measure of cost effectiveness for new and ongoing programs. They felt the Council had a long way to go in developing such a sophisticated approach to budgetmaking for higher education in the state. They desired to see a change from the traditional budget approach of asking for "a little more than is actually necessary in hopes that they will get what they really need."

Question thirteen. The final question analyzed in relation to the second hypothesis was whether legislators were satisfied with the State Council of Higher Education's past performance in the coordination of continuing education programs. Among the twelve statutory powers, the Council's coordination of continuing education and its overall planning function were ranked highest in terms of legislative

satisfaction. The legislators' responses to question thirteen are compiled in the following frequency and percentage distribution table.

Table 14
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Continuing Education

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	7	6.5
Disagree	13	12.0
Neutral	26	24.1
Agree	56	51.9
Strongly Agree	5	4.6
No Response	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

As indicated in the table, a total of 56.5% of the respondents agreed with the Council's efforts to coordinate continuing education. A majority of the legislators appeared to believe that the Council had exhibited successful leadership in initiating the consortia arrangement.

In the interviews, legislators used the term, "leadership" for the first time when they referred to

the work of the State Council in coordinating continuing education programs. Several gave the State Council the credit for blunting the attack on the consortia concept and thought that the arrangement was a positive one. They generally approved of the consortia and as one Senator put it he "hoped it worked" because it was a "great thing." A colleague found it "desirable" and a help in eliminating "the tremendous problem of duplication."

There were two distinct groups of dissatisfied legislators. The first included legislators who pointed to room for improvement in the Council's work. While they perceived that progress had been made, they felt the objectives of strong cooperation and less duplication of courses among institutions was still a long way from being achieved. One Senator suggested that the Secretary of Education enforce the consortia idea "for assuring stronger cooperation among the institutions."

The second group was composed of legislators who were generally unhappy with the consortia idea and thought perhaps the local school superintendents were essentially correct in their attack against the arrangement. For example, one House member said that "I think the biggest users of these programs as I

understand are the school divisions -- the teachers -- and I think that whatever is done in this area should take into account their needs and their desires."

This group seemed to reflect narrower political considerations more than an interest in the coordination of continuing education that could result in more efficient use of the Commonwealth's scarce educational resources.

In this section, questions two through thirteen were analyzed individually in an effort to provide some indication of which Council activities were most or least satisfactory to the members of the General Assembly. It was possible to rank order the data on the twelve statutory powers and to explain some legislators' preferences with interview materials. As a result, some observations were made about legislators' satisfaction in specific areas of the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education.

Overall Scores for Questions Two Through Thirteen

Each legislator was given an overall score for the set of questions two through thirteen, which included all twelve responsibilities of the State Council. These overall scores were analyzed to test hypothesis two on the legislators' satisfaction with

the past performance of the Council.

The overall scores for the set of questions were developed by a different numerical system than the frequencies. Each legislator was given an overall score based on the following computational method that reflected direction of the opinion as being either negative, positive, or neutral. Each response of strongly disagree was computed as a minus one (-1), and a minus five tenths or (-.50) was ascribed to disagreement. Neutral opinions were given a zero (0), while strong agreement was assigned a plus one (+1) and a plus five tenths (+.50) was computed for agreement. From these totals, legislators were categorized as either strongly in disagreement with -6.5 to -12, in disagreement with -.50 to -6, neutral with 0 points. A legislator in strong agreement had a +6.5 to +12 and one in agreement accumulated a +.50 to +6.

These overall scores were computed into two frequency and percentage distributions. The one distribution contained the scores of all respondents; the other consisted of the scores of 30 legislators in the random sample. The overall scores for all respondents are reported in the following table.

Table 15
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Overall Scores for All Respondents
on Questions 2 through 13

Response	Frequency Percent	
Strongly Disagree (-6.5 to -12)	3	2.8
Disagree (-.50 to -6)	25	23.4
Neutral (0)	12	11.2
Agree (+.50 to +6)	63	58.9
Strongly Agree (+6.5 to +12)	4	3.7

Note. N = 107 One legislator did not respond to questions 2-13.

The overall scores of 67 legislators fell within the strongly agree and agree categories. Therefore, 62.6% of the respondents appeared to be generally satisfied with the work of the State Council with respect to its statutory responsibilities. Approximately 26% of the respondents, or more than one-quarter, had overall scores within the dissatisfied range. The remaining 11.2% of the legislators were neutral toward the activities of the Council. There was clear evidence that the sample of 108 legislators were at least moderately satisfied with the State Council's handling of its statutory powers. The conclusion must be

taken together with the general observation of section one, namely, that most legislators seemed to want state-wide coordination to work.

Hypothesis two is also confirmed in the analysis of the frequency and percentage distribution of the overall scores generated by the random sample of 30 legislators. Presented in Table 16 is this distribution of overall scores.

Table 16
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Overall Scores for the Random Sample
on Questions 2 through 13

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	6	20.0
Neutral	5	16.7
Agree	18	60.0
Strongly Agree	1	3.3

Note. N = 30

As shown in Table 16, 63.3% of the 30 legislators in the random sample were satisfied compared to 62.6% of the 108 respondents. There was a similarity between the two groups in terms of their overall scores or levels of satisfaction.

These overall scores were useful in confirming the direction of legislative opinions toward the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education. The results suggested that hypothesis two was valid.

Summary

The second hypothesis was tested in questions two through thirteen of the questionnaire. Responses to each of the questions were analyzed in frequency and percentage distributions and interview materials. In addition, two frequency and percentage distributions of overall scores were assessed. The one consisted of all 108 respondents and the other, the 30 members of the random sample. In summary, the data revealed the following about the legislative satisfaction with past Council activities.

First, legislators were most satisfied with the Council's past performance in overall planning, continuing education, certifying of new schools, their approval and disapproval of new programs and their studies on the escalation of institutions. They were least satisfied with their budget recommendations, development of a data information system, creation of uniform standards of reporting and recordkeeping and in their sanctioning of enrollment projections.

Second, the legislators generally believed that the State Council had improved in discharging its responsibilities in the last few years. They recognized that the 1974 statute gave them more muscle to move forward in their coordinating efforts. Even dissatisfied legislators recognized this progress.

Third, most legislators wanted to see coordination efforts work. The differences in legislative opinion occurred over the rate, direction, and level of success. Both dissatisfied and satisfied Assembly members wanted to see a more aggressive Council. Little interest was expressed in turning to the status quo. They believed there were too many benefits to be gained from statewide coordination.

Fourth, there were differences of opinion noted among legislators on what their relationship should be to the Council and what their role should be in higher education policymaking. The legislators' perceptions in these matters determined to a degree how they viewed the work of the State Council. Some members of the General Assembly saw active roles in certain phases of Council activities, while others were more passive and relied on the Council for higher education policymaking. The latter group was inclined

to exercise review and decision making powers only when legitimate disputes occurred among experts. The obvious exception was in budgetary affairs. The former group saw active participation in those activities of the Council that involved important local political considerations and were of public demand and public interest.

Finally, an analysis of the overall scores provided clear evidence that the 108 respondents and 30 legislators in the random sample were at least moderately satisfied with the State Council's performance of its statutory powers. This data suggested that hypothesis two was confirmed. However, it should be reiterated that while the legislature indicated an overall satisfaction with the work of the Council, they believed that the agency could make some improvement in selected areas.

Hypothesis Three:

Strengthening the State Council

The third hypothesis was that legislative opinion would be favorable toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education in the future. Questions 14 through 24 were designed to measure whether legislators were favorable toward

granting new powers to the Council. Eleven areas of activity were suggested for reaction. These included such areas as the determination of admission standards, selection of faculty, and coordination of private institutions in the Commonwealth.

The eleven questions pertaining to this hypothesis were analyzed using the following data: (1) frequency and percentage distributions for each of the questions; (2) a frequency and percentage distribution of the overall scores for the 108 respondents; (3) a frequency and percentage distribution for the overall scores of the 30 legislators in the random sample; and (4) the information collected in the structured interviews was arranged according to the most common explanations given for positions taken on the extension of Council responsibilities.

Frequency and Percentage Distributions:

Questions 14 through 24

A frequency and percentage distribution of legislative responses was developed for each of the eleven new areas in which Council power might be extended. Each question was analyzed in the same sequence as it appeared in the questionnaire.

Question fourteen. Members of the General Assembly were asked whether the State Council of Higher Education

should be extended the statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education. The total frequency and percentage distribution of legislative responses is compiled in Table 17

Table 17
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Admission Standards

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	34	31.5
Disagree	44	40.7
Neutral	13	12.0
Agree	14	13.0
Strongly Agree	2	1.9
No Response	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

Just over 72% of the respondents were unfavorable toward providing the Council with Authority in admissions. A little less than one-third, or 31.5%, of the legislators indicated strong disagreement with extending to the Council this authority in admissions; while only 1.9%, or two legislators were strongly favorable.

Overall, admissions was ranked fourth by legislators

as a desirable area of Council activity. However, the total percentage of members who agreed was only 14.9%. The responses to question 14 have reflected the general negativism of legislators that will be evidenced in all of the propositions to extend the powers of the State Council.

Question fifteen. Legislative opinion was solicited in question fifteen as to whether the State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system. As shown in the following Table, there were very few legislators who were in agreement with the proposal.

Table 18
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Selection of Faculty Members

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	43	39.8
Disagree	51	47.2
Neutral	9	8.3
Agree	2	1.9
Strongly Agree	3	2.8

Note. N = 108

Ninety-four respondents, or 87% of the total, chose to disagree with the suggestion to allow the State Council to select faculty members for the state system. Of that group, 39.8% of the respondents felt "strongly" that the statutory power should not be extended to the state agency. Only five legislators agreed that selecting faculty members was a responsibility for the Council. Taken together, this data has left little question about the negative stance taken by members of the General Assembly on this proposal.

Question sixteen. Commonwealth legislators were asked whether the State Council of Higher Education should be given authority to approve all new courses offered in state colleges and universities. The dominant response to question sixteen was negative. Slightly more than 60%, or 65 of the respondents, were unfavorable. However, there was more interest expressed in granting the State Council the responsibility for approving all new courses than in any of the previous questions.

Approximately one quarter of the legislators agreed with the proposition to give the Council this power. Part of the reason for their agreement was that legislators saw a relationship between the Council's present authority to sanction new programs and the proposal to include every new course. Provided in Table 19 is a complete picture of legislative opinions in response to question

sixteen.

Table 19
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
New Courses

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	20	18.5
Disagree	45	41.7
Neutral	16	14.8
Agree	24	22.2
Strongly Agree	3	2.8

Note. N = 108

Based on the data reported in the Table, it appeared to be unlikely that the legislature would act to provide the Council with this statutory responsibility to approve new courses unless substantially more members were persuaded that there was a relationship between new courses and new programs.

Question seventeen. Legislative opinions on whether the State Council of Higher Education should extend its statutory authority to coordinate all private colleges were elicited in question seventeen. Just under three fourths of the respondents disagreed with the proposition

to extend the Council's powers to coordinate the private sector of higher education. Only 17 legislators agreed with the proposal. Presented in Table 20 is the frequency and percentage distribution for all responses on the issue of the coordination of private colleges.

Table 20
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Coordination of Private Colleges

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	43	39.8
Disagree	37	34.3
Neutral	10	9.3
Agree	15	13.9
Strongly Agree	2	1.9
No Response	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

It was clear from the data presented in Table 20 that there were strong legislative opinions in opposition to the Council being granted the power to coordinate private institutions. There were more members of the

House and Senate who "strongly disagreed" with the proposal than "disagreed." Forty-three legislators voiced an intense disagreement with question seventeen, while only two took a strong affirmative position. Therefore, it appeared unlikely that the legislature would provide the Council with the statutory power to coordinate private colleges in the foreseeable future.

Question eighteen. Should the authority of the State Council of Higher Education be extended to coordinate out-of-state institutions of higher education offering programs in non-federal facilities? Slightly over one half of the respondents revealed that they were opposed to question eighteen. They did not see any need for such a change at this time. However, less disagreement was expressed in this question than on any of the others analyzed in this section. Most of the favorable group, 27.8%, recognized that there might be some benefit to the Commonwealth's colleges and universities resulting from the coordination of out-of-state institutions. Illustrated in Table 21 is the frequency and percentage distribution for responses to question eighteen.

Table 21
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Out-of-State Institutions

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	19	17.6
Disagree	37	34.3
Neutral	21	19.4
Agree	27	25.0
Strongly Agree	3	2.8
No Response	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

There were 51.9% of the respondents who were unfavorable to the proposal for the State Council to coordinate out-of-state institutions. Moreover, of that total, there were 17.6% who strongly disagreed with it. This compared with 25% of the respondents who expressed agreement and 2.8% who strongly agreed. At this time, it does not appear that legislators are willing to extend to the State Council the power to coordinate out-of-state institutions.

Question nineteen. Opinions of the legislators were sought on whether the State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to present the

budget for the entire system of higher education to the Governor and the legislature. While the Council presently has the power to make budget recommendations to the Governor and the legislature, institutions have the right to present their budget cases individually. The single budget presentation would presumably eliminate such institutional input.

Legislative opposition to the proposal included nearly two thirds of the respondents. Presented in Table 22 is the summary of the legislative opinions expressed on question nineteen.

Table 22
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Single Budget

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	23	21.3
Disagree	43	39.8
Neutral	10	9.3
Agree	27	25.0
Strongly Agree	4	3.7
No Response	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

There were just about as many legislators in "strong" disagreement with the single budget proposal as there were in agreement. The group of unfavorables saw little chance for amending the Council's budgetary power because of intense institutional opposition and the highly political nature of the proposal. There were some legislators, however, who felt that it was a viable option and chose to agree with giving such authority to the State Council. It received more approval than any of the other propositions, but it was low in comparison to the negative opinion expressed. The negative opposition would seem to preclude any strengthening of the Council's budgetary powers at this time.

Question twenty. Senators' and Delegates' reactions were also obtained on the extension of the State Council of Higher Education's statutory authority to receive budget monies and disburse them to the state institutions of higher education. The respondents were very unfavorable to the proposition. They demonstrated little interest in granting the Council this additional authority and they saw little chance that such a distribution system would obtain General Assembly support. Only four legislators were favorable to the proposed disbursement method.

Illustrated in Table 23 is the negative pattern of legislative responses.

Table 23
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Handling of Budget Monies

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	45	41.7
Disagree	49	45.4
Neutral	10	9.3
Agree	3	2.8
Strongly Agree	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

The data indicated that there was not only a high level of disagreement, but 41.7% of the legislators chose the more intense response of strong disagreement. As a result, it was a highly unlikely prospect that the State Council would be granted the responsibility for the receipt and disbursement of budget monies for the Commonwealth's colleges and universities.

Question twenty-one. Should the State Council of Higher Education be extended the statutory authority to have control over all private endowments, gifts, funds for all state institutions of higher education? There was strong

disagreement expressed by the legislators to the question. While there were eight neutral respondents, there was only one legislator who chose to be favorable toward granting the State Council control over private endowments and gifts. As indicated in Table 24, there was little question of where the members of the General Assembly stood on the issue of private endowments.

Table 24
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Private Endowments

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	49	45.4
Disagree	50	46.3
Neutral	8	7.4
Agree	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

Ninety-nine out of 108 members of the House and Senate voiced opposition to the proposal. This question and the one related to the superboard concept elicited the most negative responses of all eleven questions. There appeared to be little likelihood of the State Council gaining control over the institutions' private endowments and gifts.

Question twenty-two. Legislators' responses were

solicited on whether the State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to modify institutional mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly. The suggestion received substantial opposition from respondents, with 81.5% disagreeing. There were only seven members of the House and Senate who believed that the State Council should have the authority to modify what had been previously adopted by the legislature. The opponents did not like the possibility of being overridden by an agency that had been created by the legislature. Shown in Table 25 is the range of responses made to the proposal.

Table 25
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Modification of Mission Statements
Adopted by the General Assembly

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	43	39.8
Disagree	45	41.7
Neutral	13	12.0
Agree	7	6.5

Note. N = 108

As reported in Table 25, nearly 40% of the respondents

chose the stronger expression of disagreement with granting this power to the State Council. The passive of a statute to give the State Council such authority to modify mission statements was unlikely when taking into consideration the data in Table 25.

Question twenty-three. Respondents were asked whether the State Council of Higher Education should have the power to approve any organizational changes in state institutions of higher education. The legislators were generally opposed to removing the prerogative away from the institutions and assigning it to the State Council. More than three fourths of the respondents revealed that they did not want such a change made. Only 10% of the representatives saw some merit in equipping the Council with this additional authority. An overview of the responses is presented in Table 26.

Table 26
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Internal Organizational Changes

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	26	24.1
Disagree	56	51.9
Neutral	14	13.0
Agree	10	9.3
Strongly Agree	1	0.9
No Response	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

Some legislators either agreed or were neutral toward the proposition, but together they did not equal one fourth of the respondents. It appeared, therefore, that the legislature would not be willing to give the State Council the responsibility to approve organizational changes currently within the prerogatives of state institutions.

Despite the significant level of legislative opposition, it should be noted that the Council has been involved in approving organizational changes. It did so in the case of a restructuring of Old Dominion University's School of Engineering. The Council may have assumed the defacto power, even though it does not have the sanction of the legislature. It is not within the purview of this study to investigate other instances of the Council's exercise of this defacto power.

Question twenty-four. Members of the General Assembly were asked to consider an entirely new governance concept for higher education in the Commonwealth, namely, the superboard. Their views were recorded on the possibility of abolishing the State Council of Higher Education, individual Boards of Visitors, and the State Board for Community Colleges to be replaced with one governing board with responsibility for the entire state system. An unequivocal "no" was the response by legislators to the superboard concept. The respondents did not want a single governing body for the Commonwealth and 91.7% voiced such

opposition. Only one legislator favored the new governance structure. A more comprehensive discussion of the superboard concept will be conducted in the last section of this chapter because of its importance to the study and in its implications for statewide planning and control of higher education. The data collected in response to the question has been compiled in Table 27.

Table 27
Frequency and Percentage Distributions
Superboard

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	63	58.3
Disagree	36	33.3
Neutral	8	7.4
Agree	1	0.9

Note. N = 108

The data revealed in the table has left little doubt about the negative position taken by legislators on replacing the present system of coordination with a single governing board for the entire state.

In this section, the frequency and percentage distributions presented for questions 14 through 24 have indicated that there was a moderate to very strong opposition

expressed to all of the eleven proposals made to increase the authority of the State Council of Higher Education. Only three suggestions received the support of at least one fourth of the legislators. These were to give the power to the Council to develop a single budget, approve all new courses, and coordinate out-of-state institutions. But the size of the opposition would prevent any cogent argument that even these three areas would be added to the Council's authority in the near future.

Overall Scores for Questions Fourteen Through Twenty-four

Each legislator was given an overall score for the set of questions fourteen through twenty-four. These overall scores were analyzed to test hypothesis three on the legislators' favorability with strengthening the authority of the State Council of Higher Education.

The same procedure was followed for establishing an overall score for legislators on questions 14 through 24 as was employed in creating one for questions 2 through 13. Numerical values from a $+ .50$ to $+1$, from a $- .50$ to -1 , and 0 were given for the five scaled responses. The values for each question were summed in order to obtain the overall scores.

These overall scores were computed into two frequency and percentage distributions. The first distribution consisted of the scores for all respondents; the second

contained the scores for the 30 legislators in the random sample. Presented in Table 28 is the frequency and percentage distribution of overall scores for the 108 respondents.

Table 28
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Overall Scores for All Respondents
on Questions 14 through 24

Response	Frequency Percent	
Strongly Disagree (-6.5 to -12)	38	35.2
Disagree (-.50 to -6)	62	57.4
Neutral (0)	5	4.6
Agree (+.50 to +6)	3	2.8
Strongly Agree (+6.5 to +12)	0	0.0

Note. N = 108

The data shown in the table provided strong evidence that the overwhelmingly majority of legislative respondents did not want to extend the powers of the State Council. One hundred of the 108 respondents had overall scores that fell within the strongly disagree and disagree categories. Only three representatives registered enough positive responses to place them within the agreement classification. Based on the high level of disagreement revealed by the data, it was

possible to draw the conclusion that hypothesis three was rejected and the legislative opinion was not favorable toward strengthening the powers or granting new authority to the State Council of Higher Education in the future.

Additional empirical evidence for rejecting the hypothesis may be found in a comparison of the overall scores of the legislators in the random sample and those of the 108 respondents. The frequency and percentage distribution of overall scores for the 30 legislators in the random sample is provided in Table 29.

Table 29
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Overall Scores for the Random Sample
on Questions 14 through 24

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	5	16.7
Disagree	24	80.0
Neutral	0	0.0
Agree	1	3.3
Strongly Agree	0	0.0

Note. N = 30

The legislators selected for the structured interview disagreed also with extending the powers of the State

Council. There was no mistake about the very negative nature of legislative opinions expressed in responses to questions 14 through 24. Hypothesis three must therefore be rejected since no clear pattern of favorable opinion was evidenced in the data.

Interview Material

The 30 legislators who were interviewed as part of this study provided valuable data concerning explanations for the substantial level of disagreement offered in responses to the questions on strengthening the powers of the State Council. They suggested also the practical and theoretical considerations affecting the subject of more state control of higher education. The superboard question will be examined in the final section of this chapter.

The interview information related to the eleven proposals for extending the Council's power will be analyzed vis-a-vis the most common reasons given for legislative responses to questions. The explanations advanced involved: (1) the purpose of an agency for statewide coordination; (2) the benefits of local institutional autonomy; (3) the desirability of diversity among the Commonwealth's colleges and universities, (4) the political feasibility of the new proposals; and (5) the destruction of the concept of the private institution in higher education.

Purpose of a statewide coordinating agency. In the interview situation, it was usual for legislators to stop after several questions in the series from 14 through 24 in order to discuss their views of the purpose of an agency for statewide coordination. They felt it important to place these new proposals within the perspective of some practical, theoretical, or philosophical framework. The framework embodied a less than omnipotent state agency, preservation of certain defined areas of institutional autonomy, prevention of duplication, and most effective use of tax monies. Legislators were firm in stressing a role for the Council that embraced "limitations." A common negative statement was that the Council should not become an "all-powerful" agency.

With this framework in mind, it was not difficult to see why the legislators expressed rather negative opposition to extensions of power for the State Council. The legislators sensed that the Council already had most of the authority it needed for coordination and they were reluctant to move it in the direction of an all-powerful governing board. The most succinct and clearest statement of the legislator's perception of the purpose and role of State Council came from a member of the House. He said, "I don't want to see the State Council of Higher Education simply become a superboard that directs every college and university as to what it can do and what it cannot do. I look

upon the State Council as being a sort of coordinating agency that prevents duplication, that brings about the best utilization of our tax resources. But not an agency that really tells each university and college what to do." Perhaps not as eloquent, but yet to the point, another legislator expressed his perspective on statewide coordination. "I don't subscribe to the North Carolina, Florida principle of the strong state governing board that runs the whole kit n' kaboodle." This legislator stressed his opposition to many of the proposals for extensions of the Council's power. He was happy with the present system with its limitations of agency power and its preservation of local autonomy. The legislators did not anticipate an all powerful role for the Council and felt its powers should be limited perhaps to those statutory activities now available to them.

It might be pointed out that among those proposals where some positive interest was expressed, the legislators seemed to recognize a relationship and benefit to the present system of coordination. For example, the proposal for coordinating out-of-state institutions received more positive response because it was seen as a means of improving the present activities of the Council. It was not viewed as movement toward the establishment of an all powerful or all governing Council. As one Senator related, "they should have the same power to coordinate the out-of-state

institutions offering programs on non-federal facilities in the state as they have with state institutions. That just makes sense." Such activities, legislators felt, tended to make statewide coordination more effective.

Institutional autonomy. The members of the House and Senate who were interviewed perceived limitations in the role and activity of the State Council. Among their reasons for this view was a strong feeling that in certain matters, such as admissions and selection of faculty, the state colleges and universities should have the freedom and independence to make these decisions. They believed that such institutional decision making or autonomy was important to the proper functioning of higher education.

Nearly every legislator interviewed made some positive comment on the importance of local autonomy. They were aware of the principle of autonomy and voiced their understanding of it in their responses to the eleven new proposals. One Delegate suggested that many of the new considerations could be "collectively combined" and answered by the realization that "there's a certain sentiment to leave a certain amount of autonomy" to the institutions of higher education. He perceived the relationship between these extensions of power and a corresponding decrease in the independence of the schools to make academic decisions.

More specifically, the legislators expressed the need for local autonomy in discussing at least six of the

proposals including admissions, approval of new courses, organizational changes, selection of faculty, the single budget system, and control over private endowments. In fact, they felt that several of these proposals represented a very serious encroachment into the affairs of the institutions. For example, legislators found it a "dangerous thing overall" for the Council to be involved in the selection of faculty and that it was "just another invasion of the rights of the institution" that should not be tolerated.

On the admissions policy question, the majority of the legislators believed that each college should be able to set their own standards. In this way, they stressed that a certain heterogeneity in the Commonwealth's system of higher education was preserved. One House member said that he thought "there ought to be a great deal of local autonomy" in admissions and that "each college and university ought to be able to use its own ingenuity to set as much as possible its standards." Another representative remarked that the admission standards of the various institutions provided "a different flavor to the different institutions" and that this "should be kept."

On the question of the Council's involvement in organizational changes, the legislators recognized that the "mission" of the colleges could only be met by "flexibility" to try different means of "internal management or

organizational changes." As one Senator commented, "the administration of each school has to have that authority," if they are to develop well-functioning organizations.

With respect to the single budget proposal, legislators objected to "eliminating the right of each school to come in and have a say about its financial policy." Otherwise, local authority was taken away and the Boards of Visitors and the Presidents lost a necessary channel for voicing the needs of their institutions. Even legislators who saw merit in the single budget qualified their answer by indicating that some institutional input must be included in the process.

Institutional autonomy was an important consideration in the opposition expressed by legislators toward extending the authority of the State Council of Higher Education. They were aware of the significance of autonomy and wanted to see institutional independence remain in certain areas of academic decision making.

Diversity among institutions of higher education.

Legislators tended to relate the concept of autonomy with the principles of diversity and flexibility. They found that with a measure of autonomy came diversity and flexibility among and within the institutions. Such diversity was perceived as a positive factor for a state system of higher education. As one Senator observed, "eliminate the diversity of the institutions then they would all be an

extension of one concept." Such homogeneity left little room for innovation or experimentation in higher education.

Several legislators found it important to discuss diversity as it related to admission standards, sanctioning of new courses, a single budget, and private endowments. For example, members of the House and Senate were opposed to any control of private endowments by the State Council. They believed that without these special funds, there would be little opportunity for the schools to develop unique academic projects. One legislator felt that these opportunities for new projects would be curtailed especially in the graduate schools if these schools had to "depend upon the state for funding." Several legislators mentioned that the University of Virginia would face serious problems in its graduate program without its \$100 million endowment funds.

Another illustration of the concern for diversity came from the negative responses to the Council certifying all new courses. Legislative opposition came from the fact that not only did it give the Council too much power, but it curtailed the flexibility of the institution "to experiment with new courses." Without such experimentation, the legislators felt that institutions risked "homogeneity" and "mediocrity." They were opposed to a sterile, uniform system being created out of too much state control. They preferred a system which encouraged diversity of programs

and missions within a coordinated framework.

Political feasibility of new proposals. Since the legislators were politicians they were also concerned about the political ramifications of several of the eleven proposals. They perceived some serious political questions involving individual institutions and alumni in the extension of Council authority into the areas of admissions, the single budget, distribution of the budget, selection of faculty, and private endowments. One Senator stated that he thought a number of proposals such as the one involving private endowments would "cause a war." Another thought the budgetary proposal would create "the greatest revolt ... in education in many years," because the colleges would not stand for being eliminated from the presentation of their own budgetary case to the Governor and legislature.

Some legislators remarked that the political implications of some of the proposals would cause more problems than the changes would be worth. Therefore, they concluded that it was unlikely for some of them "ever" to materialize. Distribution of the budget by the Council, control over private endowments, and selection of faculty were proposals that many of the legislators felt were "unlikely to ever happen." These three propositions also received the highest opposition as expressed in the frequency and percentage distributions.

Overall, the legislators appeared to be realistic when it came to the chances of the eleven propositions becoming law. They weighed the political consequences of the statutory changes against the benefits of such control as vested in the State Council. As a result, they tended to conclude that the potential problems outweighed the anticipated benefits.

Destruction of the concept of the private institution.

Legislators expressed some strong opinions on the question of extending the Council's authority to coordinate private colleges. While they felt that "it might be done on a voluntary basis," they disagreed with it being done by statutory mandate. They did not find it wise for the state to become overly involved in the affairs of private institutions. They were in philosophical agreement with "keeping them separate." Many of them presented arguments for private colleges such as the "diversity they offered," their "contributions" to the system of higher education, and the different institutional "climates" afforded students. In their view, state coordination of private colleges risked destruction of some of the principles for which they exist.

Summary. The interview data provided five major reasons for legislative opinions expressed in response to questions relating to the expansion of the State Council's authority. These explanations suggested why members of the House and Senate voiced opposition toward the eleven new

proposals. They appeared to disagree with the proposals because they did not fall within the purpose of an agency for statewide coordination as they viewed it, or they believed the benefits of institutional autonomy would be lost. In addition, legislators found it more desirable to have diversity among the Commonwealth's colleges and universities than to perpetuate a homogeneous, perhaps mediocre, and single concept system. They found some of the proposals politically unfeasible and they did not wish to see the private college concept destroyed.

Most of the structured interview data tended to confirm the rejection of hypothesis three. The legislators were not favorable to the establishment of new State Council powers. While they found that several of the propositions had some merit, there was not enough positive sentiment to suggest that any changes would be made in the near future. Only the proposal to coordinate out-of-state institutions appeared to have any real opportunity to become legislation. This proposition found some support because it tended to complete the efforts at statewide coordination.

Hypothesis Four:

Political Affiliation

The fourth hypothesis of this study was that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a

strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliation. Question 25 of the schedule asked respondents to indicate their party affiliation. Of the 108 respondents, 83 or 76.9% were Democrats, 18 or 16.7% Republicans, and 7 or 6% identified themselves as Independents. These percentages reflected the total proportions of Democrats, Republicans and Independents in the 1974-75 General Assembly. That Assembly was composed of 76.4% Democrats, 17% Republicans, and 6% Independents.

These percentages have suggested the political imbalance in the Virginia legislature and accordingly the control that the Democrats have over legislation. As the political affiliation data is presented, the Democratic totals should be especially noted as indicative of the direction the Assembly might take in strengthening the powers of the State Council.

Hypothesis four was analyzed with data generated in questions 14 through 23 and was accomplished in the following manner: (1) cross-tabulations were developed to compare legislative responses with political affiliation for each question; (2) the overall scores of the 108 respondents were cross-tabulated by political party; and (3) the analysis of variance technique was applied to the overall scores of legislators in the random sample to see if they varied with the independent variable of political

affiliation. The analysis of variance statistic was applied in order to either accept or reject the null hypothesis that the three political groups are representative of a single population, and therefore, no differences exist among them.

Cross-Tabulations: Political Affiliation

Cross-tabulations were developed to report the frequencies and percentages of legislative opinions to questions 14 through 23 when controlling for political affiliation. They were considered as indicators of whether there were any differences in legislative opinions attributable to political party affiliation on individual proposals to strengthen the State Council in such areas as admissions, selection of faculty and coordination of private colleges.

Question fourteen. The responses of legislators were elicited on whether the State Council should be extended the authority to determine admission standards. The majority of the respondents in each party were negative to the proposal. The levels of the percentages of legislators in opposition seemed to be the only differences attributable to party that were evident in the data of Table 30.

Table 30

Admissions and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	22(27.2%)	32(39.5%)	13(16.0%)	12(14.8%)	2(2.5%)
Republican	9(50.0%)	7(38.9%)	0(0.0%)	2(11.1%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	2(28.6%)	5(71.4%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 106. No response to the question caused missing observations.

The Republicans in the sample had 94.4% of their members in opposition; the Independents had 100% negativism. This compared with the 66.7% of the Democrats who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal. However, the percentage of Democrats who responded negatively was still high enough to see little possibility of the State Council being given the power to determine admission standards.

Question fifteen. In question fifteen, legislators were asked if the State Council of Higher Education should have the statutory authority to select faculty members. There was overwhelming opposition to the proposal by members of all three political groups. Shown in Table 31 is the crossbreak of legislative responses on the question of the selection of faculty members when controlling for party affiliation.

Table 31
Selection of Faculty Members
and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	32(39.0%)	37(45.1%)	8(9.8%)	2(2.4%)	3(3.7%)
Republican	8(44.4%)	9(50.0%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	2(28.6%)	5(71.4%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observations.

There seemed to be little real difference between legislators in terms of their party affiliation when it came to the Council being granted the power to select faculty members. There were 84.1% of the Democrats, 94.4% of the Republicans, and 100% of the Independents who opposed making such a legislative move.

Question sixteen. Assembly members were asked whether the State Council should be granted the authority to approve or disapprove all new courses. In terms of party sentiment, 66.7% of the Republicans were negative to the proposal. The Democrats and Independents had a lower percentage of negative responses with 58.5% and 57.2% respectively. Illustrated in Table 32 is the crossbreak of legislative responses to question

sixteen when controlling for party affiliation.

Table 32

New Courses and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	15(18.3%)	33(40.2%)	15(18.3%)	16(19.5%)	3(3.7%)
Republican	3(16.7%)	9(50.0%)	1(5.6%)	5(27.8%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	1(14.3%)	3(42.9%)	0(0.0%)	3(42.9%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observations.

Overall, the data suggested that the party members were similar in terms of their percentage of disagreement. Party differences did appear, however, in the responses generated in the neutral and agree categories. In terms of percentages, Independents were more positive toward the proposal to extend the Council's power into sanctioning new courses than they were for any other of the nine propositions. Both Republicans and Independents had higher percentages of agreement than did Democrats. But the fact remains, that all three parties had over 55% of their members in the sample opposed to the change; but more importantly, the party in control had only 23.2% in favor of extending the Council's responsibilities to certifying new courses.

Question seventeen. Legislators were asked whether the State Council of Higher Education should coordinate private colleges. There were high percentages of negative responses from the members of all three political parties in the sample. Neither the Democrats, Republicans, nor Independents wanted the State Council's authority expanded in this direction. Presented in the following table is the evidence in support of the conclusion.

Table 33

Private Colleges and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	27(33.3%)	30(37.0%)	9(11.1%)	13(16.0%)	2(2.5%)
Republican	11(61.1%)	4(22.2%)	1(5.6%)	2(11.1%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	4(57.1%)	3(42.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 106. No response to the question caused missing observations.

No real difference was noted among the parties, except perhaps in terms of intensity of the negative responses. The data provided a perspective of which groups were more strongly against the proposition. Republicans and Independents had somewhat higher percentages of "strong" disagreement than did Democrats.

Question eighteen. Responses were elicited from

Assembly members on the extension of State Council's authority to the coordination of out-of-state institutions. A majority of the legislators in each party were in opposition to the proposal. Fifty percent of the Democrats, 58.8% of the Republicans, and 57.2% of the Independents chose negative responses to the question as shown in Table 34.

Table 34
Out-of-State Institutions
and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	13(15.9%)	28(34.1%)	16(19.5%)	23(28.0%)	2(2.4%)
Republican	4(23.5%)	6(35.3%)	4(23.5%)	2(11.8%)	1(5.9%)
Independent	1(14.3%)	3(42.9%)	1(14.3%)	2(28.6%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 106. No response to the question caused missing observations.

In addition, nearly 30% of the Democrats and Independents surveyed either agreed or strongly agreed to extend the State Council's authority to coordinate out-of-state colleges and universities operating in Virginia. Overall, there did not appear to be any significant differences of opinion on this question that could be attributed to political party affiliation. The legislators were generally

opposed but in somewhat fewer numbers than on previous questions dealing with the expansion of the Council's powers.

Question nineteen. Legislative opinion was solicited in question nineteen as to whether the State Council should be given the authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education. There appeared to be some differences of opinion between the Republican respondents and those in the two other parties when the data in Table 35 was analyzed.

Table 35

Single Budget and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	19(23.2%)	32(39.0%)	7(8.5%)	21(25.6%)	3(3.7%)
Republican	3(17.6%)	5(29.4%)	3(17.6%)	7(35.3%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	1(14.3%)	6(85.7%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 106. No response to the question caused missing observations.

The Democrats and Independents in the sample had a majority of their members who responded negatively to the State Council being granted the power to present a single budget for the state system. The Republicans had less than a majority with only 8 out of 18 of their members choosing the disagreed or strongly disagreed categories. This was

the lowest level of dissatisfaction expressed by this group to any of the proposals. The Republican legislators also had higher percentages of neutral and agree responses than their colleagues in the other parties. An assessment of the impact of the Republican responses would be difficult to make without further study, especially in light of the fact that the two other political groups had sufficient numbers opposed to the proposal.

Question twenty. Question twenty was concerned with extending the State Council the statutory authority to receive and distribute budget funds. There was very strong opposition expressed by legislators in all three parties to this proposal. The levels of the parties' collective disagreement is reported in Table 36.

Table 36
Distribution of Budget Funds
and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	34(41.5%)	38(46.3%)	7(8.5%)	2(2.4%)	1(1.2%)
Republican	8(44.4%)	7(38.9%)	2(11.1%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	3(42.9%)	4(57.1%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 106. No response to the question caused missing observations.

Neither the Democrats, Republicans, or Independents were

very favorable to providing the Council with the authority to receive or disburse budget monies to the states' colleges and universities. Thus, there did not appear to be any significant differences of opinion on this question that were attributable to political party affiliation.

Question twenty-one. Little party difference was noted in the opposition of legislators to the State Council being granted the power to control private endowments. One hundred percent of the Republicans and Independents respondents and 89% of the Democrats expressed opposition to the proposal as indicated in Table 37.

Table 37
Private Endowments
and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	35(42.7%)	38(46.3%)	8(9.8%)	1(1.2%)	0(0.0%)
Republican	10(55.6%)	8(44.4%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	4(57.1%)	3(42.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observations.

The data contained in Table 37 confirmed the strength of the Democratic, Republican and Independent legislators' negative responses to state control of private endowments.

As underscored by the interviews, the legislators felt that there was little, if any, chance of such a statute "ever" becoming law.

Question twenty-two. In question twenty-two, members of the General Assembly were asked whether the State Council should be extended the responsibility to modify mission statements previously adopted by the legislature. The majority of the respondents in each party were negative to the proposal as shown in Table 38.

Table 38
Mission Statements
and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	31(37.8%)	39(47.6%)	7(8.5%)	5(6.1%)	0(0.0%)
Republican	9(50.0%)	2(11.1%)	5(27.8%)	2(11.1%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	3(42.9%)	3(42.9%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observations.

The only minor party difference seemed to be in the levels of percentages of disagreement. For example, more than 85% of the Democrats and Independents chose to oppose the proposal on the modification of mission statements while the Republicans had a lower percentage of 61.1%.

But these differences between the Republicans and the two other parties were insignificant compared to the overall opposition expressed in responses to question twenty-two.

Question twenty-three. Legislators in each of the three political groups were strongly opposed to the proposal to give the State Council the statutory power to sanction an institution's internal organizational changes. As reported in Table 39, more than 70% of the members of each party chose to oppose the proposition.

Table 39
Internal Organizational Changes
and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	18(22.0%)	44(53.7%)	13(15.9%)	6(7.3%)	1(1.2%)
Republican	8(47.1%)	6(35.3%)	1(5.9%)	2(11.8%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	0(0.0%)	5(71.4%)	0(0.0%)	2(28.6%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 106. No response to the question caused missing observations.

Overall, there did not seem to be any significant differences of opinion on this question that could be attributed to political party affiliation. Generally, the legislators in each party were strongly opposed to granting the State Council the authority to certify an institution's internal organizational changes.

In this section of cross-tabulations, some minor party differences appeared, but they seemed to make little impact on the overall negative sentiments of the legislators toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Overall Scores: Political Affiliation

The same method was used for establishing an overall score for legislators that was applied in the analysis of hypotheses two and three. The legislators' overall scores were recorded for questions 14 through 24 and cross-tabulated with party affiliation. In this way, it was possible to analyze whether there were any significant differences in legislative opinions attributable to party affiliation on this issue of strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. Presented in Table 40 are the overall scores for the 108 respondents when controlling for party affiliation.

Table 40

The Overall Scores of the 108 Respondents
Cross-tabulated by Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Democratic	25 (30%)	50 (60%)	5 (6%)	3 (4%)
Republican	10 (56%)	8 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Independent	3 (43%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note. N = 108

Revealed in the data of Table 40 is that the overall scores of respondents were not significantly different when controlling for party affiliation. Legislators' overall scores in each of the parties were generally negative. The only difference attributable to party affiliation was related to intensity of the negative responses for all eleven proposals. For example, the Republicans and Independents were more intensely in disagreement to the proposed changes than the Democrats. Fifty-six percent of the Republicans and 43% of the Independents had overall scores that fell in the strongly disagreed category compared to 30% of the Democrats. This difference does not have much impact since the overall pattern of scores among the parties remains one of opposition to the strengthening of the powers of the State Council.

Analysis of Variance:

Overall Scores and Party Affiliation

Another measure was applied to judge whether party affiliation made any significant difference in terms of legislators' responses to strengthening the State Council of Higher Education. The analysis

of variance statistic was applied to the overall scores computed for the 30 legislators in the random sample for questions 14 through 24. Party affiliation became the independent variable. The analysis of variance could determine whether the three political groups were representative of a single population. More specifically, it provided a test on which to accept or reject the null hypothesis that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliation.

The random sample of 30 interviewees did not yield equal sample sizes according to party as might be expected from the make-up of the General Assembly. Thus, it was necessary to use the computation of analysis of variance for unequal sample sizes (Li, 1969, p. 196). Revealed in Table 41 are the overall scores of the 30 legislators by political party, along with the F-ratio computed and the degrees of freedom.

Table 41

Analysis of Variance: Overall Scores of
30 Legislators and Party Affiliation

Democratic		Republican	Independent
+1.50	-5.00	-3.50	-4.50
-1.50	-5.50	-2.00	-6.00
-2.00	-5.50	-6.50	-4.50
-3.50	-5.50	-6.50	
-3.50	-5.50		
-4.00	-6.00		
-4.00	-6.00		
-4.00	-6.00		
-4.50	-7.00		
-4.50	-7.00		
-4.50	-7.50		
-5.00			
			F = .043 Df = 2 and 27

Note. N = 30

The F-ratio of .043 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis must be accepted as there was no significant difference in legislative opinions toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for political party affiliation. Based on the evidence presented in the analysis of variance

and the overall scores of the 108 respondents there appears to be little doubt but that hypothesis four was confirmed. The legislators were opposed to strengthening the state agency's authority and party affiliation made little or no differences in terms of the legislators' negative responses.

Summary. For most of the ten proposals, there was little doubt about the similarity of responses given by legislators in all three political parties. They voiced opposition to adopting most of these changes to strengthen the power of the State Council. There were some minor differences among the parties on a few individual questions, but whether these would have any impact on the total situation is unlikely.

These minor differences in legislative responses attributable to party affiliation are summarized as follows. First, a higher percentage of Independents were opposed to most of the new proposals than the two other party groups. Of course they are a relatively small group when compared to the Democrats and Republicans. This size difference must be taken into account.

Second, Republicans appeared to be more intensely opposed than the Democrats on at least seven of the proposals. In the remaining three areas, they were more in agreement than either the Democrats or Independents. These three propositions dealt with the modification of prior legislative approvals of mission statements, the single

budget, and the receipt and distribution of budget funds. The positive Republican position on the single budget proposal stood out as an expression of difference between the parties. The negative responses of the Republicans on the single budget fell below 50% of their total numbers in the sample while the Democrats and Independents had 62.2% and 100% of their respondents in opposition. It is difficult to say what impact, if any, the Republican responses would have on the proposal without further study.

Finally, there were no significant differences attributable to party affiliation based on the analysis of evidence generated in the cross-tabulation of overall scores for the 108 respondents and in the F-ratio computed in analysis of variance of the overall scores of 30 legislators in the random sample. Therefore, hypothesis four was confirmed that there would be no difference in legislative opinions toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliation.

Hypothesis Five:

Geographic Areas of Representation

The fifth hypothesis analyzed was that there would

be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' geographic areas of representation. In the survey, question 26 asked legislators for their geographic area of representation. For the purposes of the study, the Commonwealth of Virginia was divided into six geographical areas using the State Council of Higher Education's regional designations for the consortia for continuing education. In addition, the state planning districts were listed together with the geographic region in order to assist legislators in making a choice. The six geographic regional designations were the Western, Valley, Central, Capitol, Tidewater, and Northern areas.

The hypothesis was analyzed as follows: First, legislators' responses to questions 14 through 23 were compared with their geographic area of representation. Cross-tabulations were developed to report the frequencies and percentages of these comparisons. Second, the overall scores of the 108 respondents were compared by the geographic areas of representation. Third, the analysis of variance technique was applied to the overall scores of legislators in the random sample to see if they varied with the independent variable of geographic area of representation. The statistic was applied in order to either accept or reject the null hypothesis that the three political

groups are representative of a single population, and therefore, no differences existed among them on strengthening the authority of the State Council of Higher Education.

Cross-tabulation:

Geographic Areas of Representation

Cross-tabulations were computed to report the frequencies and percentages of legislative opinions in questions 14 through 23 when controlling for geographic areas of representation. They were viewed as indicators of whether there were any differences in legislative opinions attributable to geographic representation on individual proposals to strengthen the State Council. These proposals included such areas as the coordination of out-of-state institutions, the sanctioning of new courses and the selection of faculty members for the state system of higher education.

Question fourteen. In question fourteen, legislators were asked whether the State Council should be allowed to determine admission standards. On the whole, the legislators in each geographic region were similar in their responses to the question. For example, each geographic district had at least 65% of their legislators who expressed a negative viewpoint on the proposal. The Tidewater and Western delegations had the largest numbers opposed as 75%, or 40 out of 51 respondents voiced disapproval as shown in

Table 42.

Table 42
Admissions and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	8(44.4%)	6(33.3%)	2(11.1%)	2(11.1%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	2(28.6%)	3(42.9%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	1(4.3%)
Central	5(29.4%)	7(41.2%)	1(5.9%)	4(23.5%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	4(33.3%)	4(33.3%)	2(16.7%)	2(16.7%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	8(24.2%)	18(54.5%)	2(6.1%)	4(12.1%)	1(3.0%)
Northern	7(35.0%)	6(30.0%)	5(25.0%)	2(10.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observations.

In the table, there appeared to be a few minor differences of opinion between legislators from the various regions. The Central region had nearly 25% of its members who were positive to the proposal compared to the lower percentages for the other regions. And 25% of the Northern respondents gave neutral responses on this question to register their largest number of responses for any of the new propositions to deviate from their usual negative pattern. Overall, these were minor differences in comparison to the fact that 65% of the legislators in each region gave similar negative responses.

Question fifteen. Most legislators in each region were similar in their responses to oppose the proposal for the State Council to select faculty members for the various Commonwealth institutions. From 71% to 94.4% of the legislators voiced such opposition to this proposal. The only minor difference in legislative opinions due to geographic area of representation was in terms of intensity of the negative response. As illustrated in Table 43, the legislators in the Capitol and Western regions were more strongly in disagreement with the proposition than their counterparts in the other four regions.

Table 43
Selection of Faculty and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	9(50.0%)	8(44.4%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	1(14.3%)	4(57.1%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	1(14.3%)
Central	6(35.3%)	10(58.5%)	1(5.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	7(58.3%)	2(16.7%)	2(16.7%)	1(8.3%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	13(39.4%)	18(54.5%)	1(3.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.0%)
Northern	7(33.3%)	9(42.9%)	3(14.3%)	1(4.8%)	1(4.8%)

Note. N = 108

Fifty percent of the Western and 58.3% of the Capitol region

legislators responded in strong disagreement to the State Council being granted the responsibility for selecting faculty members compared to the lower percentages of the four other regions. In fact, these two regions did not have any of their representatives to agree on this question.

Overall, the general pattern of legislative response in each region was negative. The only difference in opinion that might be attributable to geographic area of representation was the minor one of intensity of the negative response.

Question sixteen. As previously reported, there was some difference of opinion expressed on the question of granting the State Council the authority to certify all new courses. Geographic area of representation appeared to play some roles since the Capitol region legislators recorded diverse views on the new course provision compared to their counterparts in other regions. The twelve legislators from the Capitol area who responded were equally divided between the negative, neutral, and positive response categories. The representatives in the other regions gave responses that were not so equally divided. Their responses were clustered more toward the negative end of the scale as reported in Table 44.

Table 44

New Courses and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	2(11.1%)	8(44.4%)	3(16.7%)	5(27.8%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	1(14.3%)	3(42.9%)	1(14.3%)	1(14.3%)	1(14.3%)
Central	2(11.8%)	8(47.1%)	2(11.8%)	5(29.4%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	2(16.7%)	2(16.7%)	4(33.3%)	4(33.3%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	8(24.2%)	16(48.5%)	3(9.1%)	5(15.2%)	1(3.0%)
Northern	5(23.8%)	8(38.1%)	3(14.3%)	4(18.0%)	1(4.8%)

Note. N = 108

Revealed in the data is an especially big difference between the 33% negative responses of the Capitol delegation and the 72.7% registered by the Tidewater delegation. On question sixteen, the conclusion to be drawn is that legislators in five geographic districts maintained a negative position on extending the Council the responsibility to approve or disapprove new courses, but that the Capitol area expressed no overall preference with an equally divided pattern of response.

Question seventeen. The majority of respondents in each region did not choose to involve the State Council of Higher Education in the coordination of private colleges.

A legislator's geographic region seemed to make little difference other than in terms of the intensity of the negative response. For example, the Valley and Central region respondents were in stronger disagreement with the proposal compared to legislators in the other regions as shown in Table 45.

Table 45
Coordination of Private Colleges and
Geographic Areas of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	3(17.6%)	6(35.3%)	4(23.5%)	3(19.6%)	1(5.9%)
Valley	5(71.4%)	2(28.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Central	5(58.8%)	7(41.2%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	4(33.3%)	5(41.7%)	1(8.3%)	2(16.7%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	11(33.3%)	11(33.3%)	3(9.1%)	7(21.2%)	1(3.0%)
Northern	10(47.6%)	6(28.6%)	2(9.5%)	3(14.3%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observation.

Suggested in the data of Table 45 is that there is not any significant difference of opinion among legislators related to geographic area of representation. Intensity of the negative response was the only minor difference indicated on the question of the State Council being granted the power to coordinate private colleges.

Question eighteen. In question eighteen, legislators were asked whether the Council should be extended the authority to coordinate out-of-state institutions. There appeared to be differences in the opinions expressed by legislators on this proposal that could be related to geographic area of representation. Revealed in Table 46 is that the six regions can be divided into three distinct groups for an analysis of the divergences in legislative opinions.

Table 46

Coordination of Out-of-State Institutions
And Geographic Areas of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	1(5.9%)	7(41.2%)	3(17.6%)	4(23.5%)	2(11.8%)
Valley	2(28.6%)	3(42.9%)	1(14.3%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)
Central	3(17.6%)	9(52.9%)	2(11.8%)	3(17.6%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	3(25.0%)	1(8.3%)	3(25.0%)	5(41.7%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	6(18.2%)	10(30.3%)	7(21.2%)	9(27.3%)	1(3.0%)
Northern	4(19.0%)	7(33.3%)	5(23.8%)	5(23.8%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observation.

In the first group, the majority of legislators in each of three regions -- the Valley, Central, and Northern -- were

opposed to the proposition. The second group included the Tidewater and Northern respondents. They differed from the first group in their totals of negative responses that represented a plurality rather than a majority of opinions expressed. Finally, the Capitol respondents had a plurality of positive versus negative responses on this proposal in contrast to the other five regions. They were the only group to demonstrate such a positive plurality on any of the suggestions to increase the authority of the State Council. Thus, legislative responses arranged according to geographic area of representation were generally negative, except for the cluster of positive responses generated by the Capitol delegates. This positive cluster of responses revealed a greater variation of opinion among the representatives than was evident when the same data was tabulated against political party affiliation, or compared with the data on other proposals to strengthen the authority of the State Council.

Question nineteen. The majority of the legislators in five out of the six geographic regions were in opposition to the statewide coordinating body being extended the statutory power to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education. As shown in Table 47, the Northern respondents did have a plurality of negative versus positive responses, but not a negative majority in terms of all opinions expressed. Nonetheless, these facts have

suggested that legislators in each of the regions were generally similar in their negative responses to the proposal. However, there are still some differences in opinion to be examined in a careful analysis of Table 47.

Table 47
Single Budget and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	2(11.1%)	7(38.9%)	4(22.2%)	4(22.2%)	1(5.6%)
Valley	1(16.7%)	2(33.3%)	0(0.0%)	3(50.0%)	0(0.0%)
Central	4(23.5%)	7(41.2%)	1(5.9%)	5(29.4%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	2(16.7%)	6(50.0%)	1(8.3%)	3(25.0%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	9(27.3%)	17(51.5%)	0(0.0%)	5(15.2%)	2(6.1%)
Northern	5(23.8%)	4(19.0%)	4(19.0%)	7(33.3%)	1(4.8%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observation.

Based on the data in the table, the six regions can be divided into two groups for a closer analysis of differences in opinion. In group one, there would be the Central, Capitol, and Tidewater legislators who evidenced moderately high percentages of negative responses from 64.7% to 78.8%. In group two, the Northern, Western, and Valley representatives can be related by their lower negative percentages.

In addition, legislators in these three regions had enough neutral and positive responses that combined added up to 50% or more of their totals. For example, the Western delegates had 22.2% of their members who gave neutral responses and 27.8% who voiced positive opinions. By dividing the six regions into two distinctive groups, there has been a sharper examination of the differences in opinion that can be related to geographic area of representation. These differences must be considered of minor importance since the overall response pattern for the legislators in each region was negative to granting the State Council the authority to present the budget for the state system of higher education. However, further study might be concentrated on the opinions of the Western, Northern, and Valley legislators.

Question twenty. Most of the legislators in each of the regions were opposed to the State Council of Higher Education becoming involved in either receiving or disbursing the budget funds for higher education. Also, there did not seem to be any differences in legislative opinion attributable to geographic area of representation. The negative opposition was too strong in each region to report otherwise. Presented in Table 48 is the similarity expressed in the negative responses of legislators in each region.

Table 48

Receipt and Distribution of Budget Funds
And Geographic Areas of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	8(44.4%)	7(38.9%)	2(11.1%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	4(57.1%)	2(28.6%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Central	7(41.2%)	8(47.1%)	2(11.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	4(33.3%)	5(41.7%)	2(17.7%)	1(8.3%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	15(45.5%)	16(48.5%)	1(3.8%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Northern	7(33.3%)	11(52.4%)	2(9.5%)	1(4.8%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 108 .

From 75% to 94% of the legislators in each region were opposed to the proposal. These high percentages only confirmed the fact that legislators were similar in their negative responses to giving the State Council the power to receive and disburse budget funds.

Question twenty-one. The proposal to have the State Council control private endowments of state institutions received even stronger opposition from legislators in all six geographic regions than was evident in question twenty. There were only parallels of opposition to be drawn among the regions as reported in Table 49.

Table 49

Private Endowments and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	8(44.4%)	9(50.0%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	3(42.9%)	4(57.1%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Central	8(47.1%)	9(52.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	6(50.0%)	4(33.3%)	2(16.7%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	16(48.5%)	15(45.5%)	2(6.1%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Northern	8(38.1%)	9(42.9%)	3(14.3%)	1(4.8%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 108

Based on the data, there was little doubt of the similarities of opinion expressed by legislators in each of the six geographic regions. Only opposition was voiced in the legislative responses tabulated in Table 49.

Question twenty-two. Question twenty-two proposed to grant the State Council the responsibility to modify mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly. More than 70% of the legislators in each geographic area were against the adoption of such a statute. As in questions twenty and twenty-one, there were few differences to relate to geographic area of

representation. Presented in Table 50 is the homogeneity of the legislative responses.

Table 50
Mission Statements and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	7(38.9%)	6(33.3%)	4(22.2%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	4(57.1%)	2(28.6%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Central	6(35.3%)	7(41.2%)	2(11.8%)	2(11.8%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	5(41.7%)	5(41.7%)	1(8.3%)	1(8.3%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	12(36.4%)	17(51.5%)	3(9.1%)	1(3.0%)	0(0.0%)
Northern	9(42.9%)	8(38.1%)	2(9.5%)	2(9.5%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 108

From 72% to 87% of the legislators in each region were in opposition to the proposal. These high percentages confirmed the point that legislators were alike in their negative responses to granting the State Council the power to modify mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly.

Question twenty-three. Over sixty percent of all respondents in each region were against the State Council of Higher Education being given the power to sanction internal organizational changes of institutions.

Legislators were similar in their general expression of opposition. As reported in Table 51, there were from 61.9% to 90.6% of the legislators in each regional area opposed to providing the Council with the responsibility to certify internal organizational changes.

Table 51
Internal Organizational Changes and
Geographic Area of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	6(35.3%)	8(47.1%)	2(11.8%)	1(5.9%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	0(0.0%)	6(85.7%)	0(0.0%)	1(14.5%)	0(0.0%)
Central	3(17.6%)	8(47.1%)	3(17.6%)	3(17.6%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	3(25.0%)	5(41.7%)	2(16.7%)	2(16.7%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	10(30.3%)	20(60.6%)	2(6.1%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.0%)
Northern	4(19.0%)	9(42.9%)	5(23.8%)	3(14.3%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107. No response to the question caused missing observations.

The only minor difference represented in the table was the variations in negative percentages among the various regions from a low of 61.9% to a high of 90.6%. Otherwise, there was only a general negative response among legislators in each geographic region to the State Council receiving the statutory authority to sanction internal organizational changes made by institutions.

Overall Scores:Geographic Area of Representation

The method for computing overall scores has been explained in some detail, so there was no need to repeat the scoring procedure. For hypothesis five, legislators' overall scores were computed for questions 14 through 24 and cross-tabulated with their geographic area of representation. In this way, it was possible to analyze whether there was any significant difference in legislative opinion attributable to geographic area of representation on strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. Shown in Table 52 are the overall scores for the 108 respondents when controlling for geographic area of representation.

Table 52

The Overall Scores of the 108 Respondents
Cross-tabulated by Geographic Areas
of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	7(38.9%)	10(55.6%)	1(5.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	4(57.1%)	3(42.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Central	5(29.4%)	12(70.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	4(33.3%)	6(50.0%)	1(8.3%)	1(8.3%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	10(30.3%)	22(66.7%)	0(0.0%)	1(4.8%)	0(0.0%)
Northern	8(38.1%)	9(42.9%)	3(14.3%)	1(4.8%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 108

In the table, there was only one legislator in each of three regions -- Tidewater, Northern, Capitol -- who accumulated an overall score of agreement. The Western, Valley and Central areas had none of their representatives to fall in the affirmative classifications. There was an obvious similarity among the overall scores of legislators with a clear negative pattern. In terms of the overall scores, hypothesis five must be accepted that there was no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for geographic area of representation.

Analysis of Variance: Overall Scores and
Geographic Areas of Representation

Another measure was applied to judge whether geographic area of representation made any significant difference in terms of legislators' responses to strengthening the State Council of Higher Education. The analysis of variance statistic was applied to the overall scores computed for the 30 legislators in the random sample for questions 14 through 24. Geographic area of representation became the independent variable. In this way, the analysis of variance would indicate whether the legislators in the six geographic regions were representative of a single population. And more specifically, it would offer a measure on which to accept or reject the null hypothesis that there would be no difference

in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for geographic area of representation.

When the 30 interviewees were divided by region, the samples yielded were unequal. As a result, the computations of the analysis of variance followed Li's procedure for unequal sample sizes. Presented in Table 53 are the overall scores of the 30 legislators by geographic area of representation along with the F-ratio computed and the degrees of freedom.

Table 53
Analysis of Variance: Overall Scores of
30 Legislators and Geographic Areas
of Representation

Western	Valley	Central	Capitol	Tidewater	Northern
-7.00	-6.50	-6.00	+1.50	-5.00	-2.00
-6.50	-3.50	-5.00	-5.50	-3.50	-1.50
-6.00	-3.50	-2.00	-4.00	-4.50	-4.00
-6.00		-4.50	-4.00	-5.50	-5.50
		-7.00		-7.50	-4.50
		-6.00		-4.50	
				-5.50	
					F = 2.36 Df = 5 and 27

Note. N = 30

The F-ratio of 2.36 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis must be accepted that there was no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the power of the State Council. Based on the evidence presented in the analysis of variance result and the overall scores of the 108 respondents, there appeared to be little doubt but that hypothesis five was confirmed.

Summary. For seven of the ten proposals, there was little doubt about the similarity of responses given by legislators in the six geographic regions. They voiced opposition to adopting these seven changes to strengthen the authority of the State Council of Higher Education. There were some differences of opinion among the legislators in the six regions on the other three questions, but whether these differences would result in any changes must be considered questionable at the present time. Divergences in opinion were discernible in the proposals to grant the State Council the powers to coordinate out-of-state institutions, sanction new courses and present a single budget for the state system of higher education.

These differences in legislators' responses attributable to geographic area of representation were summarized as follows. First, the Capitol legislators were responsible for the most divergent opinions, especially on the questions of out-of-state institutions and new courses. On the latter proposal, Capitol legislators were found to have no

preference as they were equally divided between the positive, neutral and negative responses. In contrast, the legislators in each of the other geographic areas were generally negative to providing the Council with the power to sanction new courses. In addition, the Capitol representatives were the only group to voice a plurality of positive versus negative responses toward giving the State Council the authority to coordinate out-of-state institutions. In fact, they were the only group of legislators to register such a positive plurality on any of the ten propositions.

Second, on the single budget proposal, differences of opinion were analyzed more closely by dividing the six regions into two distinct groups. In the first group were the Central, Capitol, and Tidewater legislators with high negative percentages in opposition to the proposition. In the second group, the Western, Valley, and Northern legislators had lower percentages of negative responses and enough neutral and positive answers that added up to 50% or more of their numbers.

Finally, there were no significant differences in opinion attributable to geographic area of representation based on the evidence generated in the cross-tabulation of overall scores for the 108 respondents and in the F-ratio computed in the analysis of variance of the overall scores of the 30 legislators in the random sample. Thus, hypothesis

five was confirmed that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council when controlling for a members' geographic area of representation.

Hypothesis Six:

Leadership Position

The sixth hypothesis analyzed in this study was that there would be no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. In order to test this hypothesis, a random sample of 30 members of the General Assembly was drawn that included 15 defined leaders and 15 rank and file legislators.

Hypothesis six was analyzed as follows: First, the overall scores of the 30 legislators in the random sample were compared by leadership position. Second, the t-test for small samples was applied to the overall scores of the defined leaders and rank and file members of the random sample. The t-test was applied to test the significance of the differences between means and whether or not the two groups were representative samples of the same population. In this way, the result of the t-test afforded a measure for either rejecting or accepting the null hypothesis that there would be no difference between the opinions of the defined

leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Overall Scores: Leadership Position

The computation of overall scores for leaders and rank and file members of the random sample was carried out in the same manner as has been described in previous sections of the study. For hypothesis six, legislators' overall scores were computed for questions 14 through 24 and cross-tabulated with leadership position. In this way, it was possible to analyze whether there was any significant difference in legislative opinion attributable to leadership position on strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. Presented in Table 54 are the overall scores for the 30 legislators in the random sample when controlling for leadership position.

Table 54

The Overall Scores of the 30 Legislators in
the Random Sample Cross-tabulated by
Leadership Position

Leadership Position	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Leader	1(6.7%)	13(86.7%)	0(0.0%)	1(6.7%)	0(0.0%)
Rank and File	4(26.7%)	11(73.3%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 30

The only minor difference of opinion to be noted among the defined leaders and rank and file members was in terms of intensity of the negative response. The rank and file members of the random sample had a higher percentage of their group to "strongly disagree" with the eleven proposals. But overall, the leaders and rank and file legislators were similar in their opposition to strengthening the powers of the State Council. Only one leader had an overall score to fall in a positive category. As a result, the fifth hypothesis must be accepted that there would be no difference in legislative opinions between the defined leaders and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council.

T-Test: Overall Scores and Leadership Position

The t-ratio statistic was the second measure applied in an analysis of whether leadership position made any significant difference in terms of legislators' responses to strengthening the authority of the State Council of Higher Education. The t-test was applied to the overall scores computed for the 30 legislators in the random sample for questions 14 through 24. Leadership position became the independent variable. Galfo's (1970, p. 159) explanation of the t-test for small samples was employed in the computation.

Shown in Table 55 are the overall scores of the leaders

and rank and file members along with the t-ratio computed and the degrees of freedom.

Table 55

T-Test: Overall Scores of 30 Legislators
and Leadership Position

Leader		Rank and File	
+1.50	-4.00	-2.00	-4.50
-6.00	-2.00	-5.00	-1.50
-5.00	-4.50	-7.00	-6.00
-3.50	-5.50	-4.50	-6.50
-5.50	-4.00	-3.50	-6.50
-6.00	-4.00	-4.50	-4.50
-7.50		-6.00	
-5.50		-3.50	
T-ratio = .268 DF = 28			

Note. N = 30

The t-ratio of .268 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis must be accepted that there was no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council.

The Superboard Concept

Twenty-one states had governing boards to regulate public four-year colleges and universities in 1972. These governing or "superboards" as they have been called in some states are indicative of the trend in higher education to provide for more state involvement in the decisions and development of public colleges and universities. In this study, one of the purposes was to examine the direction being considered by the legislators in the Commonwealth of Virginia in either extending the powers of the present State Council of Higher Education or in moving toward the creation of a superboard. The opinions of the members of the Virginia General Assembly were elicited for the purpose of finding out what options, if any, would be pursued.

It was the purpose of this section to analyze the opinion of legislators as they pertained to the establishment of a superboard, or a statewide governing body for the Commonwealth. Question 24 in the survey asked the legislators whether the State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual Boards of Visitors and the State Board for Community Colleges, and replaced with one superboard or governing board for the entire state.

Legislators' opinions on the creation of a superboard will be analyzed as follows: First, a frequency and percentage distribution of legislative opinions on question 24 will

be presented. Second, cross-tabulations were developed to report the frequencies and percentages of opinion when controlling for party affiliation, geographic area of representation and leadership position. Third, the interview material will be examined in terms of explanations for legislative opinions expressed on question 24.

Frequency and Percentage Distribution: Superboard

The majority of the respondents did not want a superboard system of governance for the state system of higher education, and 91.7% of them indicated opposition to it. Illustrated in Table 56 is the fact that 99 of 108 legislators were against the single governing board concept for Virginia.

Table 56
Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Superboard

Response	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	63	58.3%
Disagree	36	33.3%
Neutral	8	7.4%
Agree	1	0.9%
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%

Note. N = 108

Not only were the legislators in opposition to the superboard concept, but 58.3% of them were in strong disagreement with the proposal. Only one legislator expressed agreement with the proposition to create a statewide governing board for higher education in the Commonwealth. Therefore, legislators have voiced an overwhelming opposition to abolishing the individual Boards of Visitors and the State Board for Community Colleges and replacing them with one superboard for the entire state.

Cross-tabulations: Superboard

Cross-tabulations were computed to provide the frequencies and percentages of legislators' opinions on the superboard when controlling for party affiliation, geographic area of representation and leadership position. They were employed to indicate whether there were any differences in legislators' opinions toward the superboard concept that were attributable to political group, geographic area of representation or a position of leadership. Presented in Table 57 is the cross-tabulation of legislators' responses according to party affiliation.

Table 57

The Superboard and Party Affiliation

Party Affiliation	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Democratic	45(54.9%)	31(37.8%)	5(6.1%)	1(1.2%)	1(1.2%)
Republican	13(72.2%)	3(16.7%)	2(11.1%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Independent	5(71.4%)	2(28.6%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 107

From 88.9% to 100% of the legislators in each political group were in opposition to the superboard concept. There was a similarity in the negative responses given by legislators in each of the parties. They were generally uniform in their opposition to the superboard concept over the present system of statewide coordination.

The same strong opposition to the superboard was revealed in the data related to the geographic area of representation. In each geographic region, at least 83.3% of the legislators voiced opposition to the establishment of a superboard. The Tidewater, Capitol and Central delegations had more than 94.1% of their members expressing negative opinions. Shown in Table 58 is a cross-tabulation of Assembly members' responses according to geographic area of representation.

Table 58
The Superboard
and Geographic Area of Representation

Geographic Area	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Western	8(44.4%)	7(38.9%)	3(16.7%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Valley	4(57.1%)	2(28.6%)	0(0.0%)	1(14.3%)	0(0.0%)
Central	9(52.9%)	7(41.2%)	1(5.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Capitol	7(58.3%)	5(41.7%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Tidewater	21(63.6%)	11(33.3%)	1(3.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
Northern	14(66.7%)	4(19.0%)	3(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 108

There were more legislators in each of the geographic regions who strongly disagreed with the proposal than disagreed with it. From 44.4% to 66.7% of the legislators indicated the more intense response. The high percentages confirmed the similarity in legislators strong negative responses to a single governing board for the entire system of higher education in the Commonwealth.

When legislators' responses were controlled for leadership position, the same negative similarities were revealed in this data as appeared in the last two cross-tabulations. There was little difference of opinion expressed between the defined leaders and the rank and file legislators on the

question of a statewide governing body. Both groups were similar in their opposition to the creation of a superboard as shown in Table 59.

Table 59

The Superboard and Leadership Position

Leadership Position	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Leader	5(33.3%)	9(60.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(6.7%)	0(0.0%)
Rank and File	7(46.7%)	7(46.7%)	1(6.7%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)

Note. N = 30

Again, the responses of the leaders and the rank and file members of the random sample were alike in their opposition to the superboard concept. The empirical data in the frequency and percentage distribution, and the cross-tabulations pointed to the fact that respondents were in strong opposition to the single governing body to regulate higher education in the Commonwealth. The interview or normative information has provided some of the reasons for this strong opposition to a superboard.

Interview Material: Superboard

Each of the legislators who were interviewed was asked to discuss his reaction toward the establishment of a superboard in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Numerous probes were

also used to clarify the legislators' positions on the practical and theoretical considerations involved in the single governing board concept. The normative data was reduced to five major arguments most commonly given by legislators to explain their opposition to the superboard. These will be discussed in sequence beginning with the one cited most frequently. It should be noted that some legislators indicated several explanations for their answer to the question.

Three arguments were referred to the most by legislators in developing their positions on the superboard. Each of these had at least eight representatives that held the same view. The first of these positions was that the superboard tended to eliminate diversity within and among the various colleges and universities in the state. In fact, the argument was expressed several times in response to all of the questions that proposed more state control, and less flexibility and autonomy at the institutional level.

Diversity was discussed by the legislators as a very "positive" aspect of the Virginia system of higher education. In contrast, the single governing body was viewed as a negative factor that tended to eliminate the diversity of "innovation and experimentation" by making all institutions "an extension of one concept." One Senator stated his objection very succinctly, "I prefer to avoid a superboard on the grounds that it would have a tendency to homogenize

all the institutions of higher education. I prefer to keep the diversity of the institution. The character of these institutions is historical and also functional and should be maintained." A leader of the House of Delegates reiterated the point by saying that "all of our schools have developed their own personalities, and I don't want to see them lost." Opposition to the superboard concept arose out of a strong feeling by several legislators that the essential diversity would disappear from Virginia's institutions of higher education along with their unique personalities, history, experimentation, and innovation.

The second argument advanced by legislators opposed to the superboard was that the individual Boards of Visitors would be eliminated. Such a move, they believed, was undesirable. The local boards were perceived as important mechanisms to secure the monetary and political support necessary for the development of individual institutions. One House member said that he "wouldn't want to abolish Boards of Visitors" because they obtained "endowment support" for the schools that they could not do without. Other legislators felt that the Boards of Visitors provided important contacts between the institutions and "the community." They lent a "specific identity" to each school and were more able to adapt to the "different situations and different conditions" confronted with in the local area than could a superboard. Without the local boards, the legisla-

tors believed that the institutions would most certainly lose their individual identities, diversity, and local popular as well as financial support. The superboard was conceived as being too distant an entity that would be unable to facilitate the same benefits as the local Boards of Visitors.

A third criticism of the superboard was that in practice most of them had not provided any more benefits for the institutions or the state than did a statewide coordinating agency. The legislators contended that the State Council of Higher Education was doing just as good a job in managing the affairs of higher education for the Commonwealth as the "superboards in North Carolina, Florida or elsewhere." The comment was made by several Senators and Delegates that "the superboard hasn't accomplished anything that we haven't accomplished" with the coordinating body. A legislator remarked that he didn't know "if it's any great improvement over what we have." In other words, legislators were not convinced of any additional benefits that would accrue from the creation of a superboard for Virginia. In their view, the disadvantages of homogeneity, elimination of local boards and the perceived tendency toward mediocrity outweighed any purported advantages of greater unity and coordination.

One Senator indicated that he was well aware of the Florida system, knew its Chancellor and had visited some of

the schools. As a result, he saw no benefits for Virginia moving toward a similar statewide governance system.

Another House member made similar remarks about the North Carolina superboard. He pointed out that serious problems had developed as a result of that structure. He suggested that the statewide coordinating body offered a much better system of organization that produced a balanced authority between the state and the institutions. In his view, there were insufficient reasons for scraping the current statewide coordinating body in favor of a superboard.

The fourth repudiation of the superboard concept was that it limited seriously the autonomy of the individual institutions to make academic and internal management decisions. One Senator felt strongly that he did not want state control "to get into internal management" and he believed this would occur under a single governing body. He desired to see "incentives" for decision making remain at the local level instead of being abrogated by a superboard. Another legislator perceived greater advantages in institutional freedom than he did in having a single governing body over all institutions. He said, "There is benefit to having individual institutions" with a "certain degree of freedom to operate in their specific area as they see fit." He disliked the concentration of power in one group and thought a loss of autonomy would effect the academic area especially in terms of developing "curriculum." These academic con-

cerns must be left up to the local institutions. Another Senator was critical because he felt that "academic freedom" suffered under the unitary system.

Legislators generally discussed institutional autonomy as a "positive" element that was important to the proper functioning and maintenance of a system of higher education. They reiterated the autonomy argument several times during the interview. However, it received greatest attention in the answers to the question on the superboard. It was possible to conclude that the legislators seemed to have some philosophical appreciation for the role that institutional autonomy must play in the perpetuation of higher education, especially with regard to its decision making and governance.

A fifth objection lodged against the superboard was one tied to the disadvantages that were perceived in centralization. Legislators raised what they believed would be significant problems of "insufficient local input," "curtailment of institutional autonomy," "power in the hands of one group of people," "determining power that would reflect on every school in the Commonwealth," and "too few people involved in making too many big decisions without sufficient input to the decisions."

Several representatives also identified another important issue involved in centralization. It was the development of an extensive educational bureaucracy at the state

level. They believed that a huge bureaucratic machine with red tape would accompany a powerful state agency like a superboard. As one House member remarked, "I'm not for any more layers of bureaucracy; there are too many of them now in Richmond." Another felt that a superboard would develop a "cumbersome bureaucracy" that would cost even more money than is now being spent on the State Council of Higher Education. As a result, centralization did not receive support from members of the Virginia General Assembly. Clearly, they did not want the superboard because such a single, all-powerful group would create more bureaucracy than was now present, or in their view, necessary for higher education.

It was obvious from the interview data and the empirical data that the members of the General Assembly were strongly opposed to the creation of a superboard. The legislators were convinced that it had many disadvantages in practice that would outweigh its intended advantages. These disadvantages were the elimination of diversity among the Commonwealth's institutions of higher education, the minimization of local input with the elimination of local boards, and the limitations placed on institutional autonomy. In addition, a bureaucratic machine would develop at the state level that could not possibly respond to or understand the particular local needs and situations in higher education. For all of these reasons, the single governing board

for the Commonwealth of Virginia was disregarded as an option for the regulation and control of the state's system of higher education.

Summary

Chapter three presented the data gathered in the questionnaires and structured interviews for purposes of analyzing the six hypotheses and the superboard concept. The results of this analysis may be summarized as follows.

The first hypothesis was that the legislative opinions would be favorable toward the existing statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education. The frequency and percentage distributions related to the hypothesis seemed to confirm that the members of the General Assembly were somewhat satisfied with the existing statutory powers of the State Council. For example, the data indicated that 68.5% of the 108 respondents expressed positive responses. Perhaps, just as important the defined leaders demonstrated a higher level of satisfaction with the present powers of the Council as 73.4% of them responded positively. An analysis of the interview data on this question revealed that the legislators' positive responses were due to their view that the State Council required its statutory powers to effectively accomplish the coordination of the state's colleges and universities. They felt that prior to the 1974 enabling legislation the Council was

without adequate muscle to settle disputes, remedy disparities between colleges, curtail nonproductive programs, or eliminate duplication in new programs. The legislators wanted these actions to be taken and supported the authority that provided the Council with the power to proceed with these tasks. Therefore, it was concluded that hypothesis one was confirmed that the legislative opinions were favorable toward the existing statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education.

In hypothesis two, members of the legislature were asked whether they were satisfied with the past performance of the State Council with respect to its statutory powers. The Council's past performance in its twelve statutory responsibilities was analyzed in the legislative responses to questions 2 through 13 of the questionnaire and interview. Legislators expressed overall satisfaction with the past work of the Council. There were 62.6% of the respondents who accumulated positive overall scores for their responses to the twelve questions dealing with the past performance of the state agency. Legislators were also satisfied with the Council's work in certain specific areas of responsibility. For example, the majority of the legislators were positive about the Council's work in coordinating continuing education, in overall planning for the state and in their sanctioning of new schools, and new programs.

On the other hand, the analysis of the frequency and

percentage distribution data for individual areas also related that legislators were not as well satisfied with the Council's handling of its responsibilities in the development of a data information system, the making of budget recommendations, the development of an effective space utilization program, the approval of enrollment projections and the creation of uniform standards of reporting and recordkeeping.

An analysis of the interview data related to this hypothesis suggested that legislators believed that the State Council had done a more effective job of discharging its authority during the last few years. But they also perceived that the agency needed to improve its performance in certain specific areas as previously mentioned. It was clear from the interview responses that the delegates wanted to see coordination work. Legislators' negative responses to Council's activity in specific areas were the result of differences of opinion in how fast, in what direction, and with what level of success the agency had progressed in recent years. There was dissatisfaction noted, but it did not indicate that the system should be dismantled, only that there was a desire for a more effective and aggressive one. Hypothesis two appeared to be confirmed, but with some reservations.

The third hypothesis tested was that legislative opinions would be favorable toward strengthening the powers

of the State Council of Higher Education in the future. Eleven proposals for new Council authority were evaluated by the legislators. There was moderate to very strong opposition expressed by respondents on all of the proposals. The negative response pattern revealed little support for strengthening the powers of the State Council. For example, there were 100 out of 108 respondents whose overall scores for the eleven propositions fell into the strongly disagree or disagree categories.

As confirmed by the interview data, the legislators were opposed to an extension of Council powers because they felt that there should be "limitations" placed on the activities of a coordinating body, especially as they related to the preservation of diversity, institutional autonomy, and the protection of the concept of a private institution. In addition, many legislators stressed that some of the new proposals were not politically feasible at this time, and would cause concern and reaction by the individual institutions. Therefore, the third hypothesis was not supported by the interview and questionnaire data.

Hypothesis four held that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliation. The responses of legislators to the eleven proposals for expanding the Council's powers were controlled for political affiliation.

For most of the proposals, there was little doubt about the negative posture taken by Democrats, Republicans, and Independents in their opposition to adding any new responsibility to the state agency. There were some minor differences in legislators' responses among the parties on the single budget proposition and the coordination of out-of-state institutions. In each case, the Republicans had somewhat different opinions than the Democrats and Independents, yet they were not substantial enough to change the overall negative picture among legislators in each political party. The data validated hypothesis four.

Hypothesis five was that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' geographic areas of representation. The analysis indicated that there was little doubt about the similarity of responses given by legislators in the six geographic regions for seven of the ten proposals. Assembly members voiced opposition to adopting these seven changes to strengthen the power of the State Council. There were some differences of opinion among the legislators in the six regions on the other three questions, but whether these differences would result in any changes in the authority of the Council must be considered questionable at the present time. Disparate opinions were discernible in the proposals to grant the State Council the authority to coordinate out-

of-state institutions, sanction new courses and present a single budget for the entire state system of higher education.

The Capitol legislators were responsible for the most divergent views, especially on the questions of out-of-state institutions and new courses. In contrast to the generally negative pattern of other legislators, the Capitol delegates evidenced no preference on the latter proposal and a plurality of positive versus negative responses on the former one. In fact, they were the only group of legislators to register such a positive plurality on any of the ten propositions.

On the single budget proposal, differences of opinion were analyzed by dividing the legislators in the six geographic regions into two distinct groups. In the first group were the Central, Capitol and Tidewater legislators with high negative percentages in opposition to the proposal. In the second group, the Western, Valley, and Northern representatives had lower percentages of negative responses and enough neutral and positive answers that added up to 50% or more of their numbers. Geographic area of representation appeared to result in more differences in legislative opinion on these three powers than was evident when controlling for political party affiliation.

Overall, these differences of opinion on the three questions did not create enough diversity to change the

general conclusion on this hypothesis, especially in light of the analysis of the overall scores and F-ratio computed in the analysis of variance applied to the overall scores of legislators in the random sample. Based on the evidence generated by these last two measures there were no significant differences of opinion attributable to geographic area of representation. The null hypothesis was accepted that there would be no difference in legislative opinion due to an Assembly members' geographic area of representation.

Hypothesis six was that there would be no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. An analysis of the overall scores of the defined leaders and the rank and file members in the random sample revealed only their negative similarity and opposition to strengthening Council authority. In addition, the t-ratio of .268 computed for the overall scores of these two groups was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. The null hypothesis was accepted. Both the overall scores and the t-test confirmed that there was no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders and the rank and file members of the Virginia General Assembly.

Finally, the superboard concept was analyzed in the responses to question 24. Virginia legislators were asked whether the superboard was an acceptable alternative for

governing the state's system of higher education. There was an unequivocal negative response to this proposal. Ninety-nine of 108 respondents rejected a single, all-powerful governing board for the entire state system of higher education. Only one legislator voiced a positive response to the proposition. An analysis of the interview data revealed the legislators' opposition to a superboard and added a list of disadvantages that they felt would result from the creation of such a body. Mainly, the disadvantages reflected legislators' concern that institutions would become "an extension of a single concept." Diversity would be lost, local input minimized, a larger educational bureaucracy created, and institutional autonomy seriously limited by a superboard that regulated and controlled the entire state system of higher education.

CHAPTER FOUR
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to investigate the opinions of the members of the 1974-75 General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia toward the State Council of Higher Education. Specifically, six hypotheses were tested and the concept of a superboard for the governance of all higher education in the Commonwealth was analyzed. The conclusions and implications drawn from the data gathered in the questionnaires and structured interviews related to the six hypotheses and superboard concept will be presented in this Chapter. Some suggestions for further research will be made in the final section of the Chapter.

The first hypothesis was that legislative opinion would be favorable toward the existing statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education. The initial question in the survey was directed at providing data to support or deny the proposition. The hypothesis was accepted. An analysis of the frequency and percentage distributions related to this hypothesis seemed to confirm that the members of the General Assembly evidenced an above average satisfaction with the statutory powers of the State Council. For example, 68.5%, or 74 of the 108 respondents expressed positive opinions. Perhaps, more

importantly, the defined leaders in the random sample demonstrated a higher level of satisfaction with the present authority of the Council with 73.4% of them responding positively.

An analysis of the interview data on question one revealed that the legislators' positive responses were the result of their general view that the State Council required its statutory powers to effectively accomplish the coordination of the Commonwealth's colleges and universities. They contended that prior to the 1974 enabling legislation, the Council did not have sufficient authority to settle disputes, remedy disparities between colleges, curtail nonproductive programs, eliminate duplication and proliferation of new programs. The legislators expressed that such actions needed to be taken. As a result, they supported the authority that provided the Council with the power to proceed with these important tasks. The legislators perceived the necessity for the Council to become more than an advisory agency. They opted for an effective coordinating and regulatory body for higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The second hypothesis was concerned with whether the members of the legislature were satisfied with the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education with respect to its statutory powers. The Council's general performance level with respect to its twelve statutory

responsibilities was analyzed from the data collected in questions two through thirteen of the survey. Legislators expressed overall satisfaction with the past work of the Council. There were 62.2% of the respondents who accumulated positive overall scores for their responses to the questions dealing with the past performance of the agency. Legislators were also satisfied with the Council's work in certain specific areas of responsibility. For example, the majority of them were positive about the Council's work in coordinating continuing education programs, in overall planning for the state, and in the sanctioning of new schools and new programs.

On the other hand, the analysis of the frequency and percentage distributions for individual areas also showed that legislators were not as satisfied with the Council's exercise of its authority in the development of a data information system, the making of budget recommendations, the development of an effective space utilization program, the approval of enrollment projections, and the creation of uniform standards of reporting and recordkeeping.

An analysis of the interview data related to this hypothesis suggested that legislators believed that the State Council had done a more effective job of discharging its responsibilities during the last few years. However, they also perceived that the Council needed to improve its performance in the specific areas noted in the preceding

paragraph. It was clear from the interview responses that the delegates wanted to see coordination work. The legislators' negative responses to the Council's work in specific areas resulted from differences of opinion as to how quickly, in what direction, and with what level of success the agency had progressed in recent years. There was some dissatisfaction noted, but it was not strong enough to indicate that the system should be dismantled. It showed that there was a desire for a more effective and aggressive system. Thus, the second hypothesis was confirmed, but with some reservations.

The third hypothesis tested was that legislative opinions would be favorable toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education in the future. The legislators were asked to evaluate eleven new proposals in the survey. Ten of these dealt with extending Council responsibilities. The eleventh one suggested the establishment of a superboard for the governance of higher education in the Commonwealth.

Moderate to very strong opposition was expressed by respondents on all of the proposals. The negative response pattern revealed little support for strengthening the powers of the State Council beyond those contained in the 1974 statute. For example, there were 100 of 108 respondents whose overall scores for the eleven proposals fell into the disagree or strongly disagree categories. A

majority of the legislators indicated opposition to each suggestion for extending Council activities and responsibilities.

The interview data confirmed that the legislators were opposed to any extension of Council powers at this time. They gave several reasons for their opposition. They contended that there should be "limitations" placed on the activities of a coordinating body, especially as they affected the preservation of diversity within the educational system, maintained a certain amount of institutional autonomy, and protected the concept of a private institution. In other words, they did not believe that a coordinating body should become an all-powerful agency for state control of higher education. Furthermore, many legislators stressed that some of the proposals were not politically feasible at this time, and that they would cause concern and reaction by many at the individual institutions. They felt certain that a strong reaction would develop in response to the suggestion that the Council present a single budget for higher education to the Governor and the General Assembly.

The legislators' interview responses revealed their rejection of the third hypothesis and suggested that they were aware of the arguments against further encroachments by the state into the affairs of higher education. For example, they appeared to have some philosophical

appreciation for the underlying principles of the need for institutional autonomy in substantive areas. They wanted decision making responsibility for areas such as the selection of faculty members and the control of private endowments to remain within the individual schools and not transferred to a single governing body. Moreover, legislators acknowledged the same indictments of increased state control in higher education that have been advanced by critics in the literature. They did not want a superboard which they perceived would result in mediocrity and homogeneity in the educational system. Instead, they believed in maintaining the beneficial diversity that presently exists among the Commonwealth's colleges and universities.

The fourth hypothesis was that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for members' political party affiliation. The responses of legislators to the eleven proposals for expanding the Council's powers were analyzed in terms of differences attributed to political party affiliation. For most of the proposals, there was little doubt about uniform negative opposition of Democrats, Republicans and Independents to adding any new responsibilities to the state agency.

Some minor party differences were noted in the responses on the single budget and coordination of out-of-state

institutions. For each of these proposals, the Republicans had a somewhat different pattern of response than did Democrats and Independents. They were more positive to the single budget idea and more opposed to the coordination of out-of-state institutions than were the other groups. However, these differences were not substantial enough to change the overall negative sentiments shared by legislators of each political party toward increasing the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Additional evidence that there was no significant difference in legislative opinions due to party affiliation was found in the analysis of the distribution of overall scores and the result of the analysis of variance applied to the overall scores of the 30 legislators in the random sample. A similarity of overall scores was found in the data. Ninety to one-hundred percent of the legislators in each political party had negative overall scores. In addition, the F-ratio of .043 was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference in legislative opinion attributable to party affiliation was accepted.

The fifth hypothesis was that there would be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' geographic areas of representation. The analysis revealed that there was a

similarity in the responses given by legislators from the various geographic regions for seven of the ten proposals. Assembly members opposed the adoption of these proposed changes to strengthen the power of the State Council. There were some differences of opinion noted among the legislators in the six regions on three of the questions. Divergent opinions were discerned to the proposals that would have granted the State Council the authority to coordinate out-of-state institutions, sanction new courses, and present a single budget for the entire state system of higher education.

The legislators from the Capitol region were responsible for the most divergent views, especially on the questions dealing with out-of-state institutions and new courses. In contrast to the general negative pattern of other legislators, they indicated no general preference on the latter proposal and a plurality of positive versus negative responses on the former one. They were, in fact, the only group of legislators to register such a pattern of positive opinion to any of the propositions for expanding the Council's authority.

On the proposal for a single budget, differences of opinion were analyzed by dividing the legislators in the six geographic regions into two distinct groups. The first group was composed of the Central, Capitol, and Tidewater legislators who were found to be generally opposed to the

proposal. They recorded high percentages of negative responses. The second group, consisting of the Western, Valley, and Northern representatives, had lower percentages of negative responses and sufficient neutral and positive responses that equalled 50% or more of their members. Geographic area of representation appeared to result in more differences in legislative opinion on these three proposals than was apparent when controlling for political party affiliation.

Overall, these differences of opinion did not change the general conclusion on this hypothesis, especially when the analysis of the overall scores and the F-ratio computed for the overall scores of the 30 legislators in the random sample was considered.

An analysis of the overall scores revealed that only one legislator in each of the Tidewater, Northern, and Capitol regions accumulated an overall score of agreement. None of the Western, Valley, or Central representatives had overall scores that fell into the affirmative classifications. There was an obvious similarity among the overall scores of legislators with a clear negative pattern.

The F-ratio of 2.36 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence in the analysis of variance applied to the overall scores of the 30 legislators. The null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference in legislative opinions attributable to geographic area of

representation was accepted.

The sixth hypothesis was that there would be no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders and the rank and file members of the General Assembly with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. An analysis of their overall scores revealed only their similarity in opposing the strengthening of Council authority. Over 93% of the leaders and 100% of the rank and file members were opposed to any increases in responsibilities of the State Council. In addition, the t-ratio of .268 computed for the overall scores of these groups was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. Both the overall scores and the result of the t-test confirmed that there was no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders and the rank and file members of the Virginia General Assembly with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Finally, the legislators' responses to the establishment of a superboard were analyzed in depth. The concept was treated separately because of its potential as an option for the governance of the state's system of higher education and in the implications for the Commonwealth's institutions if such a change was made.

Virginia legislators were asked whether the State Council of Higher Education should be abolished together

with the individual Boards of Visitors and the State Board for Community Colleges, and be replaced with a single governing board for the entire state. The negative response to this proposal was unequivocal. Ninety-nine of 108 respondents rejected the superboard concept for Virginia. One legislator indicated support for the proposal and the remaining eight delegates were neutral.

Analysis of the interview data confirmed the legislators' opposition to a superboard and added a list of disadvantages that they felt would result from the creation of such a body. These disadvantages reflected legislators' concern that institutions would become "an extension of a single concept." Diversity would be lost, local input minimized, a larger educational bureaucracy created, and institutional autonomy seriously limited by a superboard that regulated and controlled the entire state system of higher education.

The respondents did not want to establish the single governing board as other states had done in recent years. Members of the General Assembly cited the negative experiences of several other southern states with governing boards as examples of their criticisms of such bodies. In the legislators' views, the Commonwealth of Virginia should not replace the coordinating body and the various Boards of Visitors with a single governing board for all of the public institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth.

Implications for Further Research

The main purpose of this study was to examine the opinions of the members of the General Assembly toward the statewide coordinating body for higher education in Virginia. As a result of the findings generated from this study, several areas should be considered for further research. The data collected during this study has provided a basis for such activity. Specifically, it is suggested that the following areas should be considered for more in-depth research.

1. A follow-up study should be conducted for a comparison of the nature and direction of any changes in the legislative opinions toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

2. The defacto powers of the State Council of Higher Education should be examined in light of its dejure authority contained in the 1974 statute, and the general negative sentiments of legislators toward increasing the agency's responsibilities.

3. Secondary analysis of the interview data should be conducted to examine more closely the role that legislators perceive for themselves in higher education policy-making.

4. The present research design could be expanded to obtain the opinions of the Governor and his staff, state

budget officials, Presidents of colleges and universities and Boards of Visitors members toward the general performance level of the State Council and the strengthening of its powers. The data generated from such a study could be compared and combined with the existing information for a comprehensive image of opinions toward the current and future governance options for higher education in the Commonwealth.

5. An in-depth study should be conducted on the nature and scope of political demands made on legislators by their constituents that are related to higher education matters, especially those that conflict with areas of responsibility or decisions made by the State Council of Higher Education.

Appendices

Appendix A

INSTRUCTIONS: FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, PLEASE PLACE A CHECK MARK (✓) AS TO WHETHER YOU STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, ARE NEUTRAL TOWARD, STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH EACH STATEMENT.

Strongly Agree=SA
Agree=A

Neutral=N

Strongly Disagree=SD
Disagree=D

1. The present statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education are satisfactory.....
2. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in carrying out its overall planning functions for the state system has been satisfactory.....
3. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving the mission statements of the various colleges and universities in the state has been satisfactory.....
4. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in studying the proposed escalation of various institutions in the state system has been satisfactory...
5. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving enrollment projections for the state system has been satisfactory...
6. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving requests for new programs in state system has been satisfactory.....
7. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in discontinuing nonproductive programs in state system has been satisfactory.....
8. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving establishment of new branches, schools, departments, etc. has been satisfactory.....
9. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing a data information system has been satisfactory.....
10. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing uniform standards for reporting, accounting, record keeping has been satisfactory.....
11. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving space utilization changes has been satisfactory.....

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

12. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in making budget recommendations has been satisfactory.....
13. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in coordinating continuing education offerings has been satisfactory.....
14. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education.....
15. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system.....
16. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve all new courses offered in the state system.....
17. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate all private colleges in addition to its present responsibilities for the public sector.....
18. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate out-of state institutions of higher education offering programs in non-federal facilities.....
19. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the legislature and the Governor.....
20. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to receive the budget monies and disperse them to the state institutions of higher education.....
21. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have control over all private endowments, gifts, funds, etc. for all state institutions of higher education.....
22. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have the authority to modify institutional mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly.....

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

SA A N SD D

23. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve or disapprove any organizational changes that fall currently within the internal management prerogatives of the state institutions of higher education.....

SA A N SD D

24. The State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual boards of visitors and the State Board of Community Colleges, and replaced with one super-board or governing board for the entire state.....

SA A N SD D

INSTRUCTION: QUESTIONS 25 and 26 WILL PROVIDE SOME DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION CONCERNING RESPONDENTS. MERELY CHECK APPROPRIATE SPACE.

25. Party affiliation:

_____ Democrat

_____ Republican

_____ Independent

_____ Other, please note _____

26. The State Council of Higher Education has established six continuing education consortia areas for the state. Please check the consortia area that you represent. For ease of reference, the planning districts included in each area are also provided.

_____ Western area (Planning districts 1,2,3,4,5,12)

_____ Valley area (Planning districts 6,7,9)

_____ Central area (Planning districts 10,11,13,14,16,17,18)

_____ Capitol area (Planning districts 15,19)

_____ Tidewater area (Planning districts 20,21,22)

_____ Northern area (Planning district 8)

Appendix B

INSTRUCTIONS: I will be asking you questions concerning the State Council of Higher Education and its statutory powers. The purpose of the interview is to provide legislators with an opportunity to express their views more fully as to the reasons for their answers. For convenience, let me provide you with a copy of the initial responses. For each of the following questions please tell me first whether you strongly agree, agree, are neutral toward strongly disagree with each statement and then you may expand on your answer.

STRONGLY AGREE=SA
AGREE=A

NEUTRAL=N

STRONGLY DISAGREE=SD
DISAGREE=D

INTERVIEWS; First, I will ask you a general question:

1. The present statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education are satisfactory.

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

What changes, if any, would you like to see in the law?

2. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in carrying out its overall planning functions for the state system has been satisfactory.

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

Would you like to see more or less planning? Why?

What improvements might you suggest in overall planning?

3. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving the mission statements of the various colleges and universities in the state has been satisfactory

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If Satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

Why role, if any, do you feel the legislature should play in the process of apporring or disapproving mission statements?

NAME: _____

4. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in studying the proposed escalation of various institutions in the state system has been satisfactory.

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

How do you view the enlargement of any of the existing state institutions? Do you find yourself in agreement or disagreement with State Council?

5. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving enrollment projections for the state system has been satisfactory

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

6. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving requests for new programs in the state system has been satisfactory

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be Specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

Do you feel the legislature should play any role with regard to approving or disapproving new programs? Have you had any constituent response to this area of concern of the State Council?

7. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in discontinuing nonproductive programs in the state system has been satisfactory

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be Specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

Do you feel the legislature should play any role with regard to discontinuing of non-productive programs? Have you had any constituent response to this area of concern?

8. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving establishment of new branches, schools, departments etc. has been satisfactory
SA A N SD D

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

How do you feel about the legislature giving direct approval for a new branch, school, department etc.? Have you had any constituent response to this area of concern?

9. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing a data information system has been satisfactory
SA A N SD D

If satisfied, why? Be Specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

10. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing uniform standards for reporting, accounting, record keeping has been satisfactory
SA A N SD D

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not?

What improvements would you personally find helpful? Why?

11. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving space utilization changes has been satisfactory
SA A N SD D

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

What improvements do you feel could be made in space utilization?

Have you had an constituent reponse to this area of concern? What kind?

12. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in making budget recommendations has been satisfactory

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

Any changes that you would suggest in State Council's budget making process? In specific recommendations?

13. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in coordinating continuing education offerings has been satisfactory

SD _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

If satisfied, why? Be specific.

If not satisfied, why not? Be specific.

Would you like to see any changes in coordination of continuing education by State Council? Do you feel the legislature has any role to play in process of coordination of continuing education? Have you had any constituent response in this area of concern? What kind?

14. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education.

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

In what ways, might the State Council change admission standards? Why? Have you had any constituent response to this area of concern? Have you heard other legislators express interest with regard to admission standards? What views have they expressed?

15. The State Council should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system.

SA A N SD D

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?
Any legislative interest expressed?

16. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve all new courses offered in the state system

SA A N SD D

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

17. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate all private colleges in addition to its present responsibilities for the public sector.

SA A N SD D

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

If positive toward, what improvements could be made with regard to coordination of public sector by State Council?

18. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate out-of-state institutions of higher education offering programs in non-federal facilities.

SA A N SD D

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?
If positive, do you feel such a change would be helpful to institutions in your area? In what ways?

19. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the legislature and the Governor
SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

Would you personally find the single budget recommendation helpful
Why?

20. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to receive the budget monies and disperse them to the state institutions of higher education.
SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

21. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have control over all private endowments, gifts, funds etc for all state institutions of higher education.
SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

22. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have the authority to modify institutional mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly.
SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

23. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve or disapprove any organizational changes that fall currently within the internal management prerogatives of the state institutions of higher education

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

24. The State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual boards of visitors and the State Board of Community Colleges, and replaced with one superboard or governing board for the entire state.

SA _____ A _____ N _____ SD _____ D _____

What are the reasons for your answer? Would you vote for such a change?

Any legislative or constituent interest expressed? What kind?

Do you feel that in the future there might be a move toward a superboard? Why? Why not? How soon?

Do you personally lean toward the direction of a superboard?

Is there anything else about the role of the State Council, how it works or might work that you think I might pay attention to in my study?

Any lessening of powers of State Council, for example?

25. Party affiliation:

_____ Democrat _____ Republican _____ Independent
 _____ Other, please note _____

26. The State Council of Higher Education has established six continuing education consortia areas for the state. Please tell me the consortia area that you represent.

_____ Western area (Planning districts 1,2,3,4,5,12)
 _____ Valley area (Planning districts 6,7,9)
 _____ Central area (Planning districts 10,11,13,14,16,17,18)
 _____ Capitol area (Planning districts 15,19)
 _____ Tidewater area (Planning districts 20,21,22)
 _____ Northern area (Planning district 8)

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, L. State planning for higher education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1969.
- Berdahl, R. Statewide coordination of higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Chambers, M. M. Voluntary statewide coordination in public higher education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.
- Code of Virginia. Vol. 5, Cumulative Supplement, 1974.
- Corson, J. J. Governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Crane, W., Jr., & Watts, M. W. State legislative systems. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968.
- Davidson, R. H. The role of the Congressman. New York: Pegasus, 1969.
- Dressel, P. L. & Faricy, W. Return to responsibility. Washington: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.
- Eells, W. C. Surveys of American higher education. New York: The Carnegie Foundation, 1937.
- Emmert, P. & Brooks, W. D. Methods of research in communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Epstein, L. Politics in Wisconsin. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.
- Eulau, H. & Quinley, H. State officials and higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Galfo, A. & Miller, E. Interpreting educational research. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1970.
- Gleazer, E. J., Jr., & Yarrington, R. Coordinating state systems. Washington: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.
- Glenny, L. A. Long-Range planning for state educational needs. Paper presented at a meeting of the Education Commissions of the States, Denver, Colorado, May, 1967.

- Glenny, L. A. Autonomy of public colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1959.
- Glenny, L. A. & Dalglish, T. K. Higher education and the law. In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), The University as an organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Goodall, L. Legislature and university: The uneasy partnership. Educational Record, Winter 1971, 52, 36-40.
- Goodall, L. Emerging political issues for state coordinating boards. Journal of Higher Education, March, 1974, XLV, 219-228.
- Gorden, R. Interviewing strategy, techniques and tactics. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Gould, S. B. The university and state government: Fears and realities. In W. J. Minter (Ed.), Campus and Capitol. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.
- Halstead, D. K. Statewide planning in higher education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Harris, N. C. State-level leadership for occupational education. In J. L. Wattenbarger & L. W. Bender (Eds.), Improving statewide planning. Washington: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.
- Heard, A. Interviewing Southern politicians. American Political Science Review, 1950, 44, 886-896.
- Hodgkinson, H. L. & Meeth, L. R. Power and authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.
- Hyman, H. Interviewing in social research. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1954.
- Jennings, G. Virginia's government. Richmond: Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, 1974.
- Jewell, M. & Patterson, S. C. The legislative process in the United States. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Kahn, R. & Cannell, C. The dynamics of interviewing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.

- Keeton, M. Shared authority on campus. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1973.
- Leege, D. C. & Francis, W. L. Political research. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.
- Lerbinger, O. Designs for persuasive communication. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972.
- Li, J. C. R. Statistical inference. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1964.
- Louisiana. Joint legislative committee on higher education. Special Report. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1958.
- Massachusetts. Special commission on audit of state needs. Needs in Massachusetts higher education. Boston, Massachusetts, 1958.
- McConnell, T. B. The coordination of state systems. In L. Wilson (Ed.), Patterns in American higher education. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.
- Meller, N. Legislative behavior research. The Western Political Quarterly, March, 1960, 13, 131-153.
- Miller, J. L. Coordination versus centralized control. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1972, 27, 237-244.
- Milstein, M. M. & Jennings, R. E. Educational interest group leaders and state legislators: Perceptions of the educational policy-making process. Education Administration Quarterly, Winter, 1972, 2, 54-70.
- Moos, M. & Rourke, F. E. The campus and the state. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1959.
- North Carolina. Commission on Higher Education. State Supported Higher Education in North Carolina. Raleigh, North Carolina, 1955.
- Nowlan, J. D. The politics of higher education: Lawmakers and the academy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 6073-A. (University Microfilms No. 74-5651, 229)
- O'Neil, R. The Eclipse of faculty autonomy. Houston, Texas: Assembly on University Goals and Governance, 1971.

Perkins, J. A. (Ed.). The university as an organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Patterson, S. & Wahlke, J. C. Dimension of support in legislative systems. In A. Kornberg (Ed.), Legislatures in comparative perspective. New York: David McKay Company, 1973.

Richardson, R. C. & Blocker, C. E. & Bender, L. W. Governance for the two-year college, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Ruby, R. H. Attitudes of Mississippi legislators toward higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1973), Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 7007-A. (University Microfilms No. 74-11,443, 121)

South Carolina. Fiscal Survey Commission. State institutions of higher education. Charleston, South Carolina, 1956.

State Council of Higher Education. The Virginia plan. Richmond, Virginia: State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, 1974.

Ulmer, S. S. Political decision-making. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Publishers, 1970.

Wahlke, J. C. & Eulau, H. & Buchanan, W. & Ferguson, L.C. The legislative system. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Wattenbarger, J. L. Who now has the power? In J. L. Wattenbarger & L. W. Bender (Eds.), Improving statewide planning. Washington: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.

Wengert, E. S. & Harwood, D. S., Jr., & Marquis, L. & Goldhammer, K. The Study of Administration. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon.

Williams, R. L. Legal bases of boards of higher education. Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1971.

VITA

Marlene Joyce Clay Hager was born in Detroit, Michigan, July 14, 1941. She graduated from Wayne State University in June of 1963 with a Bachelor of Science degree in English and Speech Communication. She was elected to Delta Sigma Rho/Tau Kappa Alpha, national speech honorary society in her junior year at Wayne State University and received activities scholarships for three consecutive years for her work on the University's debate team. In June 1964, she completed her Masters of Arts degree in Speech Communication and Organizational Analysis from Wayne State University while substitute teaching for the Detroit school system.

From 1964 to 1965, Mrs. Hager was an English and Sociology teacher at Goldsboro High School, Goldsboro, North Carolina. During the same period, she taught Speech Communication courses in the evening at the Goldsboro extension of East Carolina University and continued with this assignment until the Summer, 1967. From 1966 to 1967, she also taught Speech Communication and English on a part-time basis for Mount Olive Junior College in Mount Olive, North Carolina and coached their debate team.

When Mrs. Hager's husband left the United States Air Force and went to graduate school, she taught in the Speech Communication Department at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville from 1968 to 1969. From 1970 to 1973, she was a full-time instructor in the Speech Communication Department at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia.

Mrs. Hager has published several articles and was selected on a competitive basis to read her paper, "National Negro Business League, 1900-1915," in San Francisco at National Speech Communication Association Convention in 1971. She has published in the Speech Teacher, Virginia Education Association Journal and Virginia Social Science Journal.

Mrs. Hager is married to David R. Hager and they have two children.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the opinions of the members of the 1974-75 General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia toward the State Council of Higher Education. Specifically, six hypotheses were tested and the concept of a superboard was analyzed. The six hypotheses were as follows:

1. That legislative opinion will be favorable toward the existing statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education.
2. That the members of the legislature will be satisfied with the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education with respect to its statutory powers.
3. That legislative opinion will be favorable toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education in the future.
4. That there will be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliations.
5. That there will be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' geographic area of representation.
6. That there will be no differences between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

The study surveyed all 140 members of the Virginia General Assembly. Of these, 108 or 77.1% of the legislators completed the questionnaire. A random sample of 15 defined leaders and 15 rank and file Assembly members were also interviewed to provide explanations for answers given in the questionnaire. The following findings were among those generated by the research.

1. The first hypothesis was accepted. Over 68% of the respondents expressed positive opinions toward the existing statutory powers of the state agency.
2. The second hypothesis was accepted, but with some reservations. Over 62% of the legislators expressed overall satisfaction with the past work of the Council. But they expressed some dissatisfaction with the Council's work in specific areas such as in the development of a data information system, the making of budget recommendations, the development of an effective space utilization program, the approval of enrollment projections, and the creation of uniform standards of reporting and recordkeeping.
3. The third hypothesis was rejected. A majority of the respondents indicated opposition to each of the eleven new suggestions for extending Council responsibilities.
4. The fourth hypothesis was accepted. For most of the proposals, there was little doubt about the uniform negative opposition of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents to adding any new responsibilities to the state agency.
5. The fifth hypothesis was accepted. There was a similarity in the negative responses given by legislators from each geographic region on seven of the ten proposals. Some divergence in opinion occurred on the suggestions that the Council coordinate out-of-state institutions, sanction new courses and present a single budget, but it was not significant enough to reject the hypothesis.
6. The sixth hypothesis was accepted. There was little question about the uniform negative opposition of both the defined leaders and the rank and file members of the General Assembly to any increases in Council's work.
7. The Virginia legislators were against the establishment of a superboard. Only one legislator expressed a positive response to the superboard concept.